Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 9 2001
CLERK

(54) (40) (41)

Nos. 00-1751, 00-1777 and 00-1779

In the Supreme Court of the United States

SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, Superintendent
of Public Instruction, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, *et al.*,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit**

JOINT APPENDIX

BETTY D. MONTGOMERY
Attorney General of Ohio
DAVID M. GORMLEY
State Solicitor

KENNETH W. STARR
ROBERT R. GASAWAY
Kirkland & Ellis
655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 879-5000

JUDITH L. FRENCH*
KAREN L. LAZORISHAK
JAMES G. TASSIE
ROBERT L. STRAYER
Assistant Attorneys General
30 East Broad Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3428
(614) 466-2872

**Counsel of Record*

Petitions For Writ Of Certiorari Filed: May 23 and 25, 2001
Certiorari Granted: September 25, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Appendix A
(Relevant docket entries from the
Courts below) 1a

Appendix B
(Ohio Rev. Code 3313.974)..... 21a

Appendix C
(Ohio Rev. Code 3313.975)..... 24a

Appendix D
(Ohio Rev. Code 3313.976)..... 28a

Appendix E
(Ohio Rev. Code 3313.977)..... 31a

Appendix F
(Ohio Rev. Code 3313.978)..... 33a

Appendix G
(Ohio Rev. Code 3313.979)..... 38a

Appendix H
(Ohio Rev. Code 3314.01)..... 41a

Appendix I
(Ohio Rev. Code 3314.02)..... 44a

Appendix J
(Ohio Rev. Code 3314.04)..... 49a

Appendix K
(Ohio Rev. Code 3314.06)..... 50a

Appendix L
(Ohio Rev. Code 3314.11)..... 52a

Appendix M
(Ohio Rev. Code 3314.12)..... 53a

Appendix N
(Affidavit of Caroline M. Hoxby)..... 54a

Appendix O
(Affidavit of Kim Metcalf)..... 66a

Appendix P
(Affidavit of Paul E. Peterson)..... 73a

Appendix Q
(Affidavit of David L. Brennan)..... 144a

Appendix R
(Affidavit of Jim Daubenmire)..... 149a

Appendix S
(Affidavit of Steven M. Puckett)..... 157a

Appendix T
(Affidavit Lytle Davis)..... 165a

Appendix U
(Affidavit of Leigh-Anne Ford)..... 168a

Appendix V
(Affidavit of Linda Massengale)..... 171a

Appendix W
(Affidavit of Senel Taylor)..... 173a

Appendix X
(Affidavit of Johnnietta McGrady)..... 176a

Appendix Y
(Affidavit of Amy Hudock)..... 179a

Appendix Z
(Affidavit of Shelia Bolek)..... 182a

Appendix AA
(Affidavit of Delories Jones)..... 186a

Appendix BB
(Affidavit of Cynthia L. Felden)..... 188a

Appendix CC
(Affidavit of Dawn Call)..... 190a

Appendix DD
(Affidavit of Angela Grandberry)..... 192a

Appendix EE
(Affidavit of Thomas Barrett)..... 194a

Appendix FF
(Affidavit of Ivy T. Chambers)..... 196a

Appendix GG
(Affidavit of China Weaver-Brown)..... 198a

Appendix HH
(Joint Affidavit of School Psychologists)..... 200a

Appendix II
(The Racial, Economic, and Religious Context of Parental Choice in Cleveland) 206a

Appendix JJ
(Affidavit of Christine Suma) 220a

Appendix KK
(Declaration of David P. Zanotti) 223a

Appendix LL
(Declaration of Dr. Howard Fuller) 228a

Appendix MM
(Declaration of Alice O'Brien) 237a

Appendix NN
(Exhibits B-G of the Alice O'Brien Declaration) 245a

Appendix OO
(Statements regarding religiously-affiliated schools) 293a

Appendix A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION AT COLUMBUS

NO. 99-CV-1740

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

V.

SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, DEFENDANT

DOCKET ENTRIES

DATE	DOCKET NUMBERS	PROCEEDINGS
7/20/99	1	COMPLAINT for declaratory & injunctive relief. (Service by Clerk requested: summons issd, magistrate consent form issd by cert mail on 7/20/99) (35 pgs) (dh) [Entry date 07/21/99] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

7/27/99	17	ANSWER to Complaint by Senel Taylor, Johnnietta McGrady, Christine Suma, Arkela Winston, Amy Hudock (5 pgs) (dh) [Entry date 07/28/99] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

8/2/99	23	MOTION by Hanna Perkins School to intervene (17 pgs) w/attached proposed ans & memo contra mot for prel inj (jk) [Entry date 08/03/99] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

8/24/99	48	ORDER granting motion by pltfs for preliminary injunction; the defts are enjoined from instituting or continuing to administer the Ohio Pilot Scholarship Program pending the outcome of a decision on the merits in this case. [3-1] (issued on 8/24/99) (28 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 8/24/99] (dh) [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

8/24/99	53	ORDER consolidating case 1:99cv1740 with case 1:99cv1818, as pltf Gatton, et al's mtn was granted in case 1:99cv1818. (issued on 8/25/99) (1 pg) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 8/26/99] (dh) [Entry date 08/26/99] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

8/27/99	55	ORDER: motion by state defts to stay the order of 8/24/99 [49-1] is granted in part and denied in part, with the following modifications: 1) The stay is applicable to only those students who were enrolled in the Pilot Program under the 1995 Act during the last academic year; it is not applicable to students who are new enrollees; 2) The stay shall extend only for one semester or until the court renders a final decision on permanent injunctive relief, whichever is sooner; and 3) The Ct sets the following schedule for trial of this action: (a) counsel shall confer and work out a discovery schedule regarding any pertinent issues, including those which specifically bear on whether or not the Program involved has a primary effect of advancing religion and whether it avoids excessive entanglements under applicable Supreme Court precedents, by 9/6/99. Discovery to be complete by 10/29/99; (b) telephonic conference is set for 1:00 p.m. on 9/7/99; (c) Any dispositive motions must be filed by 11/15/99, responses are due by 11/29/99, replies by 12/8/99; and (d) Trial is set for 9:00 a.m. on 12/13/99 (issd on 8/27/99) (4 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 8/27/99] (shh) [Edit date 08/27/99] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

8/31/99	58	ORDER granting motions by Senel Taylor, Johnnietta McGrady, Christine Suma, Arkela Winston & Amy Hudock [14-1] & Hanna Perkins School to intervene as defts in case 1:99cv1740 [23-1] (issd by fax 8/31/99) (5 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 9/1/99] (dh) [Entry date 09/01/99] [Edit date 09/08/99] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

9/15/99	66	ORDER denying motion by state dfts' to dismiss [29-1] in 1:99cv01740 & 1:99cv1818. (issd by fax 9/15/99) (12 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 9/16/99] (dh) [Entry date 09/16/99] [Edit date 04/26/00] [1:99cv1740 1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

9/29/99	74	ANSWER to pltfs Doris Simmons-Harris, et al's Complaint by deft Susan Tave Zelman in 1:99-cv-01740 & defts Susan Tave Zelman, State of Ohio & Sandra Berry in 1:99-cv-01818. (9 pgs) (dh) [Edit date 09/29/99] [1:99cv1740 1:99cv1818]
9/29/99	75	ANSWER to pltfs Sue Gatton, et al's Complaint by deft Susan Tave Zelman in 1:99-cv-01740 & defts Susan Tave

Zelman, State of Ohio & Sandra Berry in 1:99-cv-01818. (11 pgs) (dh) [1:99cv1740 1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

12/20/99	131	ORDER granting motion by pltfs in 1:99cv1740 for summary judgment & denying defts mtn for summary judgment; State defts are permanently enjoined from administering the Voucher Program; this Ct stays this Ct's Order pending Sixth Circuit review, as all cnsl have consented to a stay. [83-1], [97-1], [92-1], [86-1] dismissing case (issued on 12/20/99) (59 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 12/20/99] (dh) [1:99cv1740]
12/20/99	132	JUDGMENT entered for pltfs Doris Simmons-Harris, et al & pltfs Sue Gatton, et al & against defts Susan Tave Zelman, et al, intervening defts Senel Taylor, et al & intervening defts Hanna Perkins School, et al, as the Ct granted pltfs' mtn for SJ & denied defts' mtn for SJ. (issued on 12/20/99) (2 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 12/20/99] (dh) [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

1/12/00	137	NOTICE of Appeal by intervenors/defts Senel Taylor

Johnietta McGrady, Christine Suma, Arkela Winston and Amy Hudock in 1:99cv01740 & 1:99cv1818 re: order [131-2] & re: jgm entry [132-1] (cc: all counsel-notice only. USCA-notice and doc(s) mailed on 1/12/00) (1 pg) (shh) [Edit date 01/12/00] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

1/12/00 138 NOTICE of Appeal by State defts Susan Tave Zelman, the State of Ohio and Saundra Berry in 1:99cv1740 & 1:99cv1818 re: order [131-2] & re: jgm entry [132-1] (cc: all counsel-notice only. USCA-notice and doc(s) mailed on 1/13/00) (4 pgs) (shh) [Entry date 01/13/00] [1:99cv1740]

* * * * *

1/13/00 139 NOTICE of Appeal by intervenor-deft Hanna Perkins School in 1:99cv1740 & 1:99cv1818 re: order [131-2] & re: jgm entry [132-1] (cc: all counsel-notice only. USCA-notice and doc(s) mailed on 1/13/00) (3 pgs) (shh) [1:99cv1740]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION AT COLUMBUS

NO. 99-CV-1818

SUE GATTON, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

V.

SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

DOCKET ENTRIES

DATE	DOCKET NUMBERS	PROCEEDINGS
7/29/99	1	COMPLAINT for Declaratory & Injunctive Relief. (Service: summons issd by cert mail by Clerk, magistrate consent form issd) (12 pgs) (jam) [Entry date 07/30/99] [1:99cv1818]
	* * * * *	
8/3/99	8	MOTION by Hanna Perkins School, et al for intervention as defts. (Proposed answer attached) (attach & 4 pgs) (jam) [Edit date 08/03/99] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

8/5/99	14	ORDER transferring case to Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. as a case related to 1:99cv1740 (issued on 8/5/99) (1 pg) Judge Ann Aldrich & Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 8/6/99] (jam) [Entry date 08/06/99] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

8/10/99	15	ANSWER to Complaint by proposed intervenors/defts Senel Taylor, et al., (8 pgs) (jw) [Entry date 08/11/99] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

8/24/99	24	ORDER granting pltfs' motion for prel inj; the defts are enjoined from instituting or continuing to administer the Ohio Pilot Scholarship Program pending the outcome of a decision on the merits in this case. [3-2] (issued on 8/24/99) (28 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 8/24/99] (dh) [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

8/24/99	29	ORDER granting motion by pltfs in case 1:99cv1818 for consolidation of this action with 1:99cv1740 [3-1] (issued on 8/25/99) (1 pg) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date:

8/26/99] (dh) [Entry date 08/26/99] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

8/27/99	30	ORDER: motion by state defts to stay order of 8/24/99 [25-1] is granted in part and denied in part, with the following modifications: 1) The stay is applicable to only those students who were enrolled in the Pilot Program under the 1995 Act during the last academic year; it is not applicable to students who are new enrollees; 2) The stay shall extend only for one semester or until the court renders a final decision on permanent injunctive relief, whichever is sooner and 3) The Ct sets the following schedule for trial of this action: (a) counsel shall confer and work out a discovery schedule regarding any pertinent issues, including those which specifically bear on whether or not the Program involved has a primary effect of advancing religion and whether it avoids excessive entanglements under applicable Supreme Court precedents, by 9/6/99. Discovery to be complete 10/29/99; (b) telephonic conference is set for 1:00 p.m. on 9/7/99; (c) Any dispositive motions must be filed by 11/15/99; responses are due by 11/29/99; replies by 12/8/99; (d) Trial is set for 9:00 a.m. on 12/13/99 (issd on 8/27/99) (4 pgs) Judge Solomon

Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 8/27/99] (shh) [Edit date 08/27/99] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

8/31/99 32 ORDER granting motion by Hanna Perkins School, et al for intervention as defts. [8-1] Hanna Perkins School, Ivy Chambers, Carol Lambert, Delories Jones, Our Lady of Peace, Westpark Lutheran, Lutheran Memorial added as intervenors to case(s) 1:99-cv-01818. (issued by fax 8/31/99) (5 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 9/1/99] (dh) [Entry date 09/01/99] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

9/15/99 36 ORDER denying motion by state dfts' to dismiss [29-1] in 1:99cv01740 & 1:99cv1818. (issd by fax 9/15/99) (12 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 9/16/99] (dh) [Entry date 09/16/99] [Edit date 04/26/00] [1:99cv1740 1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

9/29/99 38 ANSWER to pltfs Doris Simmons-Harris, et al's Complaint by deft Susan Tave Zelman in 1:99-cv-01740 & defts Susan Tave Zelman, State of Ohio & Sandra Berry in 1:99-cv-01818. (9 pgs) (dh) [Edit date 09/29/99] [1:99cv1740 1:99cv1818]

9/29/99	39	ANSWER to pltfs Sue Gatton, et al's Complaint by deft Susan Tave Zelman in 1:99-cv-01740 & defts Susan Tave Zelman, State of Ohio & Sandra Berry in 1:99-cv-01818. (11 pgs) (dh) [1:99cv1740 1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

12/20/99	40	ORDER granting pltfs mtn for summary judgment & denying defts mtn for summary judgment; State defts are permanently enjoined from administering the Voucher Program; this Ct stays this Ct's Order pending Sixth Circuit review, as cnsl for all pltfs have consented to a stay; dismissing case (issued on 12/20/99) (59 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 12/20/99] (dh) [1:99cv1818]
12/20/99	41	JUDGMENT entered in favor of pltfs Doris Simmons-Harris, et al & pltfs Sue Gatton, et al & against defts Susan Tave Zelman, et al, intervening defts Senel Taylor, et al & intervening defts Hanna Perkins School, et al purs to Order of 12/20/99. (issued on 12/20/99) (2 pgs) Judge Solomon Oliver Jr. [EOD Date: 12/20/99] (dh) [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

1/12/00	44	NOTICE of Appeal by intervenors/ defts Senel Taylor, Johnnietta McGrady, Christine Suma, Arkela Winston and Amy Hudock in 1:99cv1740 & 1:99cv1818 re: order [40-2] & re: jgm entry [41-1] (cc: all counsel-notice only. USCA-notice and doc(s) mailed on 1/12/00) (1 pgs) (shh) [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

1/12/00	45	NOTICE of Appeal by State defts Susan Tave Zelman, the State of Ohio & Sandra Berry in 1:99cv1740 & 1:99cv1818 re: order [40-2] & re: jgm entry [41-1] (cc: all counsel-notice only. USCA-notice and doc(s) mailed on 1/13/00) (4 pgs) (shh) [Entry date 01/13/00] [1:99cv1818]

* * * * *

1/13/00	46	NOTICE of Appeal by intervenor-deft Hanna Perkins School in 1:99cv1740 & 1:99cv1818 re: order [40-2] & re: jgm entry [41-1] (cc: all counsel-notice only. USCA-notice and doc(s) mailed on 1/13/00) (3 pgs) (shh) [1:99cv1818]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

Nos. 00-3055/3060/3063

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS; MARLA FRANKLIN; STEVEN BEHR, Rev.; SUE GATTON; MARY MURPHY; MICHAEL DEBOSE; CHERYL DEBOSE; GLENN ALTSCHULD; DEIDRA PEARSON

Plaintiffs - Appellees

v.

SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN,
Superintendent of Public Instruction,
State of Ohio; SAUNDRA BERRY

Defendants - Appellants

DOCKET ENTRIES

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1/13/00	Civil Case Docketed. Notice filed by Appellant Susan Tave Zelman, Appellant Saundra Berry. Transcript needed: [00-3060]

* * * * *

1/24/00 ORDER filed granting motion to consolidate for briefing; appellant's to file one consolidated appendix; granting the motion to expedite argument at the earliest practicable date, filed by Clint Bolick, Marvin E. Frankel, Andrew D. Roth, Karen L. Lazorishak, David J. Young [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

* * * * *

5/1/00 CERTIFIED RECORD filed. Volumes include 2 Tr; 13 Pl. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (dac) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

* * * * *

5/18/00 APPENDIX filed by Edward B. Foley for Appellant Saundra Berry, Appellant Susan Tave Zelman in 00-3055; 00-3060; 00-3063 (Volumes I through X). Copies: 5. Certificate of service date 5/15/00 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (tmb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

* * * * *

5/22/00 FINAL BRIEF filed by David C. Tryon, Matthew Berry, and Clint Bolick for Appellant Senel Herman Taylor. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/19/00. Number of Pages: 50. [00-3055] (vf) [00-3055]

5/22/00 FINAL REPLY BRIEF filed by David C. Tryon, Matthew Berry, and Clint Bolick for Appellant Senal Herman Taylor. Copies: 7. Certificate of

service date 5/19/00. Number of Pages: 24. [00-3055] (vf) [00-3055]

* * * * *

5/23/00 FINAL BRIEF filed by James G. Tassie, Karen L. Lazorishak, Roger F. Carroll, Mary Lynn Readey, and Edward B. Foley for Appellant Saundra Berry, Appellant Susan Tave Zelman. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/22/00. Number of Pages: 56. [00-3060] (vf) [00-3060]

5/23/00 FINAL REPLY BRIEF filed by James G. Tassie, Karen L. Lazorishak, Roger F. Carroll, Mary Lynn Readey, and Edward B. Foley for Appellant Saundra Berry, Appellant Susan Tave Zelman. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/22/00. Number of Pages: 20. [00-3060] (vf) [00-3060]

* * * * *

5/23/00 FINAL BRIEF filed by Michael R. Reed and David J. Young for Appellant Hanna Perkins. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/22/00. Number of Pages: 47. [00-3063] (vf) [00-3063]

5/23/00 FINAL REPLY BRIEF filed by Michael R. Reed and David J. Young for Appellant Hanna Perkins. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/22/00. Number of Pages: 26. [00-3063] (vf) [00-3063]

* * * * *

5/23/00 FINAL BRIEF filed by Andrew D. Roth for Appellee Mary Murphy, Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris

Simmons-Harris, Christopher A. Lopez for Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris , Judith E. Schaeffer for Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, Elliot M. Mincberg for Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, Raymond Vasvari for Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, David G. Latanick for Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, Robert H. Chanin for Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, Steven K. Green for Appellee Deidra Pearson, Appellee Glenn Altschuld, Appellee Cheryl DeBose, Appellee Michael DeBose, Appellee Mary Murphy, Appellee Sue Gatton, Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, Elliot M. Mincberg for Appellee Deidra Pearson, Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Marla Franklin, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris, Alice Margaret O'Brien for Appellee Deidra Pearson, Appellee Steven Behr, Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/22/00 . Number of Pages: 68. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (vf) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

5/23/00 FINAL BRIEF filed by Marvin E. Frankel for Appellee Cheryl DeBose, Appellee Sue Gatton. Copies: 7. Certificate of service date 5/22/00. Number of Pages: 47. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (vf) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

* * * * *

12/11/00 OPINION filed: AFFIRMED, decision for publication pursuant to local rule 206 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063]. James L. Ryan, Circuit Judge concurring in part and dissenting in part, Eugene E. Siler, Circuit Judge, Eric L. Clay, Authoring Circuit Judge. (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

12/11/00 JUDGMENT: AFFIRMED. (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

12/19/00 OPINION CORRECTION LETTER sent indicating revisions to published opinion filed December 11, 2000 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (lkm) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

12/22/00 PETITION for en banc rehearing filed by Edward B. Foley for Appellants Saundra Berry, Susan Tave Zelman. Certificate of service date 12/21/00. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

12/27/00 ADDITIONAL PETITION for en banc rehearing filed by David J. Young for Appellant Hanna Perkins. Certificate of service date 12/22/00. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

12/27/00 ADDITIONAL PETITION for en banc rehearing filed by Clint Bolick for Appellant Senel Herman Taylor. Certificate of service date 12/22/00. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

1/22/01 LETTER SENT by blh to Marvin E. Frankel and Robert H. Chanin for Appellees Cheryl DeBose, Sue Gatton, Steven Behr, Marla Franklin, Doris

Simmons-Harris, Deidra Pearson notifying that party is to respond to a petition for en banc rehearing [2280088-1] filed by David J. Young, [2280089-1] filed by Clint Bolick, [2280086-1] filed by Edward B. Foley. Response due by 2/7/01. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063]. (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

2/6/01 RESPONSE to a petition for en banc rehearing [2280088-1] filed by David J. Young, [2280089-1] filed by Clint Bolick and [2280086-1] filed by Edward B. Foley. Response filed by Robert H. Chanin for Appellees Doris Simmons-Harris, Deidra Pearson, Steven Behr, Marla Franklin. Certificate of service date 2/5/01. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

2/7/01 RESPONSE to a petition for en banc rehearing [2280088-1] filed by David J. Young, [2280089-1] filed by Clint Bolick, and [2280086-1] filed by Edward B. Foley. Response filed by Marvin E. Frankel for Appellees Cheryl DeBose, Sue Gatton, Deidra Pearson, Steven Behr, Marla Franklin, Doris Simmons-Harris. Certificate of service date 2/6/01. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

* * * * *

2/28/01 ORDER filed denying petition for en banc rehearing [2280088-1] filed by David J. Young, the petition en banc rehearing [2280089-1] filed by Clint Bolick, and the petition for en banc rehearing [2280086-1] filed by Edward B. Foley [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063]. James L. Ryan,

Eugene E. Siler, Eric L. Clay, Circuit Judges. (blh) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

3/2/01 Appellant MOTION filed to stay mandate pending filing for certiorari and final disposition of this case before the Supreme court. Motion filed by Karen L. Lazorishak for Appellant Saundra Berry, Appellant Susan Tave Zelman in 00-3060, Roger F. Carroll for Appellant Saundra Berry, Appellant Susan Tave Zelman in 00-3060, Mary Lynn Readey for Appellant Saundra Berry, Appellant Susan Tave Zelman in 00-3060. Certificate of service date 3/2/01 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

3/5/01 Appellant MOTION filed to stay mandate pending conclusion of all proceedings before the U.S. Supreme Court. Motion filed by Clint Bolick for Appellant Senel Herman Taylor in 00-3055. Certificate of service date 3/2/01 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

3/5/01 Appellant MOTION filed to stay mandate. Motion filed by Michael R. Reed for Appellant Hanna Perkins in 00-3063, David J. Young for Appellant Hanna Perkins in 00-3063. Certificate of service date 3/5/01 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

3/7/01 Appellee RESPONSE filed regarding a motion to stay mandate; previously filed by Clint Bolick in 00-3055. Response from Marvin E. Frankel for Appellee Cheryl DeBose, Appellee Sue Gatton in 00-3055, Robert H. Chanin for Appellee Doris Simmons-Harris in 00-3055. Certificate of

service date 3/6/01 [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

3/8/01 ORDER filed granting motion to stay mandate to allow appellants' time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari, and thereafter until the Supreme Court disposes of the case, but the mandate shall promptly issue if the petition is not filed within 90 days from the date of final judgment by this Court. [00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063] in 00-3055, 00-3060, 00-3063. Entered by order of the court. (nb) [00-3055 00-3060 00-3063]

Appendix B

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3313: BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ORC Ann. 3313.974 (Anderson 1999)

§3313.974 Definitions.

As used in this section and in sections 3313.975 [3313.97.5] to 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code:

(A) "Individualized education program" and "handicapped child" have the same meanings as in section 3323.01 of the Revised Code.

(B) "Mainstreamed handicapped student" means a handicapped child who has an individualized education program providing for the student to spend more than half of each school day in a regular school setting with nonhandicapped students.

(C) "Separately educated handicapped student" means a handicapped child who has an individualized education program providing for the student to spend at least half of each school day in a class or setting separated from nonhandicapped students.

(D) "Low-income family" means a family whose income is below the level which the superintendent of public instruction shall establish.

(E) "Parent" has the same meaning as in section 3313.98 of the Revised Code.

(F) "Registered private school" means a school registered with the superintendent of public instruction pursuant to section 3313.976 [3313.97.6] of the Revised Code.

(G) "Alternative school" means a registered private school located in a school district or a public school located in an adjacent school district.

(H) "Tutorial assistance" means instructional services provided to a student outside of regular school hours approved by the commission on school choice pursuant to section 3313.976 [3313.97.6] of the Revised Code.

HISTORY: 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

The provisions of §§ 41, 46 of HB 282 (148 v --) read as follows:

SECTION 41. Sections 3313.974, 3313.975, 3313.976, 3313.977, 3313.978, and 3313.979 of the Revised Code contained within the purview of Sections 1 and 2 of this act, which establish the Pilot Project Scholarship and Tutorial Assistance Program, are repealed and reenacted with a modification in order to restore them to effectiveness as part of the law and to reinstate the program with a modification. The Supreme Court of Ohio, in *Simmons-Harris v. Goff* (1999), [86 Ohio St.3d 1, 711 N.E.2d 203] invalidated the sections as they resulted from Am. Sub. H.B. 117 of the 121st General Assembly, 146 Ohio Laws 900, holding their enactment in that act to have been violative of the one-subject rule, Ohio Constitution, Article II, Section 15(D).

This reinstatement of the Pilot Project Scholarship and Tutorial Assistance Program is a continuation of the program operating in the 1998-1999 school year, with the

modifications made in this act. Students who received scholarships that year may continue to receive scholarships in subsequent years, as provided in division (C)(1) of new section 3313.975 of the Revised Code, until they complete eighth grade, as long as they comply with the requirements of new sections 3313.974 to 3313.979 of the Revised Code and the General Assembly appropriates funds for the program.

Amendments to the Pilot Project Scholarship Program subsequent to Am. Sub. H.B. 117 also lost effectiveness because of the invalidation of the original enactment. The repeal and reenactment of section 3313.975 of the Revised Code contained within the purview of Sections 1 and 2 of this act also restore these subsequent amendments, by Am. Sub. H.B. 215 and Am. Sub. H.B. 770 of the 122nd General Assembly, to effectiveness as part of the law. The amendment of section 3313.975 of the Revised Code in Am. Sub. H.B. 215 corrected a constitutional deficiency noted in *Simmons-Harris v. Goff*, unreported, 10th District Court of Appeals (1997).

Section 3313.977 as repealed and reenacted within the purview of Sections 1 and 2 of this act omits original division (A)(1)(d) of that section to correct a constitutional deficiency noted in *Simmons-Harris v.* Goff (1999) [86 Ohio St.3d 1, 711 N.E.2d 203].

SECTION 46. The repeal by this act of sections 3313.974, 3313.975, 3313.976, 3313.977, 3313.978, 3313.979, 3317.053, and 3317.16 of the Revised Code is not subject to the referendum. Therefore, under Ohio Constitution, Article II, Section 1d and section 1.471 of the Revised Code, the repeals go into immediate effect when this act becomes law.

Appendix C

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3313: BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ORC Ann. 3313.975 (Anderson 1999)

§3313.975 Pilot project scholarship program established.

As used in this section and in sections 3313.975 [3313.97.5] to 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code, "the pilot project school district" or "the district" means any school district included in the pilot project scholarship program pursuant to this section.

(A) The superintendent of public instruction shall establish a pilot project scholarship program and shall include in such program any school districts that are or have ever been under federal court order requiring supervision and operational management of the district by the state superintendent. The program shall provide for a number of students residing in any such district to receive scholarships to attend alternative schools, and for an equal number of students to receive tutorial assistance grants while attending public school in any such district.

(B) The state superintendent shall establish an application process and deadline for accepting applications from students residing in the district to participate in the scholarship program. In the initial year of the program students may only use a scholarship to attend school in grades kindergarten through third.

The state superintendent shall award as many scholarships and tutorial assistance grants as can be funded given the amount appropriated for the program. In no case, however, shall more than fifty per cent of all scholarships awarded be used by students who were enrolled in a nonpublic school during the school year of application for a scholarship.

(C)(1) The pilot project program shall continue in effect each year that the general assembly has appropriated sufficient money to fund scholarships and tutorial assistance grants. In each year the program continues, no new students may receive scholarships unless they are enrolled in grade kindergarten, one, two, or three. However, any student who has received a scholarship the preceding year may continue to receive one until the student has completed grade eight.

(2) If the general assembly discontinues the scholarship program, all students who are attending an alternative school under the pilot project shall be entitled to continued admittance to that specific school through all grades up to the eighth grade that are provided in such school, under the same conditions as when they were participating in the pilot project. The state superintendent shall continue to make scholarship payments in accordance with division (A) or (B) of section 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code for students who remain enrolled in an alternative school under this provision in any year that funds have been appropriated for this purpose.

If funds are not appropriated, the tuition charged to the parents of a student who remains enrolled in an alternative school under this provision shall not be increased beyond the amount equal to the amount of the scholarship plus any additional amount charged that student's parent in the most recent year of attendance as a participant in the pilot

project, except that tuition for all the students enrolled in such school may be increased by the same percentage.

(D) Notwithstanding sections 124.39, 3307.35, and 3319.17 of the Revised Code, if the pilot project school district experiences a decrease in enrollment due to participation in a state-sponsored scholarship program pursuant to sections 3313.974 [3313.97.4] to 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code, the district board of education may enter into an agreement with any teacher it employs to provide to that teacher severance pay or early retirement incentives, or both, if the teacher agrees to terminate the employment contract with the district board, provided any collective bargaining agreement in force pursuant to Chapter 4117. Of the Revised Code does not prohibit such an agreement for termination of a teacher's employment contract.

HISTORY: 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

The provisions of §§ 4.34, 4.35 of HB 282 (148 v --) read as follows:

SECTION 4.34. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall contract with an independent research entity to develop a methodology and research design for an evaluation of the pilot project approved pursuant to section 3313.975 of the Revised Code. The independent research entity shall consult with the Legislative Office of Education Oversight in the development of the methodology and research for the evaluation. The evaluation shall consist of two parts. The first part shall be a formative evaluation examining the implementation of the program, which shall be completed by December 31, 1997. The second part shall be a comprehensive evaluation of the results of the program, which shall be completed by September 1, 1999. The

comprehensive evaluation shall include at a minimum a study of the impact of scholarships on student attendance, conduct, commitment to education, and standardized test scores; parental involvement; the school district's ability to provide services to district students; and the availability of alternative educational opportunities. The evaluation shall also study the economic impact of scholarships on the school district.

SECTION 4.35. Notwithstanding division (C)(1) of new section 3313.975 of the Revised Code, in addition to students in kindergarten through third grade, initial scholarships may be awarded to fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in fiscal year 2000 and to fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grade students in fiscal year 2001.

See provisions, §§ 41, 46 of HB 282 (148 v --), following RC § 3313.97.4.

Appendix D

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3313: BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ORC Ann. 3313.976 (Anderson 1999)

§3313.976 Eligibility of private schools and public schools in adjacent districts; tutorial assistance.

(A) No private school may receive scholarship payments from parents pursuant to section 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code until the chief administrator of the private school registers the school with the superintendent of public instruction. The state superintendent shall register any school that meets the following requirements:

(1) The school is located within the boundaries of the pilot project school district;

(2) The school indicates in writing its commitment to follow all requirements for a state-sponsored scholarship program specified under sections 3313.974 [3313.97.4] to 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code, including, but not limited to, the requirements for admitting students pursuant to section 3313.977 [3313.97.7] of the Revised Code;

(3) The school meets all state minimum standards for chartered nonpublic schools in effect on July 1, 1992, except that the state superintendent at the superintendent's discretion may register nonchartered nonpublic schools meeting the other requirements of this division;

(4) The school does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or ethnic background;

(5) The school enrolls a minimum of ten students per class or a sum of at least twenty-five students in all the classes offered;

(6) The school does not advocate or foster unlawful behavior or teach hatred of any person or group on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion;

(7) The school does not provide false or misleading information about the school to parents, students, or the general public;

(8) The school agrees not to charge any tuition to low-income families participating in the scholarship program in excess of ten per cent of the scholarship amount established pursuant to division (C)(1) of section 3313.978 [3313.97.8] of the Revised Code, excluding any increase described in division (C)(2) of that section. The school shall permit any such tuition, at the discretion of the parent, to be satisfied by the low-income family's provision of in-kind contributions or services.

(B) The state superintendent shall revoke the registration of any school if, after a hearing, the superintendent determines that the school is in violation of any of the provisions of division (A) of this section.

(C) Any public school located in a school district adjacent to the pilot project district may receive scholarship payments on behalf of parents pursuant to section 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code if the superintendent of the district in which such public school is located notifies the state superintendent prior to the first day of March that the

district intends to admit students from the pilot project district for the ensuing school year pursuant to section 3327.06 of the Revised Code.

(D) Any parent wishing to purchase tutorial assistance from any person or governmental entity pursuant to the pilot project program under sections 3313.974 [3313.97.4] to 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code shall apply to the state superintendent. The state superintendent shall approve providers who appear to possess the capability of furnishing the instructional services they are offering to provide.

HISTORY: 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix E

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3313: BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ORC Ann. 3313.977 (Anderson 1999)

§3313.977 Admission of students to registered private school.

(A)(1) Each registered private school shall admit students to kindergarten and first, second, and third grades in accordance with the following priorities:

(a) Students who were enrolled in the school during the preceding year;

(b) Siblings of students enrolled in the school during the preceding year, at the discretion of the school;

(c) Children from low-income families attending school or residing in the school district in which the school is located until the number of such students in each grade equals the number that constituted twenty per cent of the total number of students enrolled in the school during the preceding year in such grade. Admission of such twenty per cent shall be by lot from among all low-income family applicants who apply prior to the fifteenth day of February prior to admission.

(d) All other applicants residing anywhere, provided that all remaining available spaces shall be filled from among such applicants by lot.

Children from low-income families not selected by lot under division (A)(1)(c) of this section shall be included in the lottery of all remaining applicants pursuant to division (A)(1)(d) of this section.

(2) Each registered private school shall first admit to grades four through eight students who were enrolled in the school during the preceding year. Any remaining spaces for students in these grades may be filled as determined by the school.

(B) Notwithstanding division (A) of this section, except where otherwise prohibited by federal law, a registered private school may elect to admit students of only one gender and may deny admission to any separately educated handicapped student.

(C) If a scholarship student who has been accepted in accordance with this section fails to enroll in the school for any reason or withdraws from the school during the school year for any reason, the school may elect to replace such student with another scholarship student only by first offering the admission to any low-income scholarship students who filed applications by the preceding fifteenth day of February and who were not accepted at that time due to space limitations.

HISTORY: 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix F

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3313: BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ORC Ann. 3313.978 (Anderson 1999)

§3313.978 Implementation of program by state superintendent and school officials; scholarships and tutorial assistance grants.

(A) Annually by the first day of November, the superintendent of public instruction shall notify the pilot project school district of the number of initial scholarships that the state superintendent will be awarding in each of grades kindergarten through third.

The state superintendent shall provide information about the scholarship program to all students residing in the district, shall accept applications from any such students until such date as shall be established by the state superintendent as a deadline for applications, and shall establish criteria for the selection of students to receive scholarships from among all those applying prior to the deadline, which criteria shall give preference to students from low-income families. For each student selected, the state superintendent shall also determine whether the student qualifies for seventy-five or ninety per cent of the scholarship amount. Students whose family income is at or above two hundred per cent of the maximum income level established by the state superintendent for low-income families shall qualify for seventy-five per cent of the scholarship amount and students whose family income is below two hundred per cent of that maximum income level shall qualify for ninety per cent of

the scholarship amount. The state superintendent shall notify students of their selection prior to the fifteenth day of January and whether they qualify for seventy-five or ninety per cent of the scholarship amount.

(1) A student receiving a pilot project scholarship may utilize it at an alternative public school by notifying the district superintendent, at any time before the beginning of the school year, of the name of the public school in an adjacent school district to which the student has been accepted pursuant to section 3327.06 of the Revised Code.

(2) A student may decide to utilize a pilot project scholarship at a registered private school in the district if all of the following conditions are met:

(a) By the fifteenth day of February of the preceding school year, or at any time prior to the start of the school year, the parent makes an application on behalf of the student to a registered private school.

(b) The registered private school notifies the parent and the state superintendent as follows that the student has been admitted:

(i) By the fifteenth day of March of the preceding school year if the student filed an application by the fifteen day of February and was admitted by the school pursuant to division (A) of section 3313.977 [3313.97.7] of the Revised Code;

(ii) Within one week of the decision to admit the student if the student is admitted pursuant to division (c) of section 3313.977 [3313.07.7] of the Revised Code.

(c) The student actually enrolls in the registered private school to which the student was first admitted or in another registered private school in the district or in a public school in an adjacent school district.

(B) The state superintendent shall also award in any school year tutorial assistance grants to a number of students equal to the number of students who receive scholarships under division (A) of this section. Tutorial assistance grants shall be awarded solely to students who are enrolled in the public schools of the district in a grade level covered by the pilot project. Tutorial assistance grants may be used solely to obtain tutorial assistance from a provider approved pursuant to division (D) of section 3313.976 [3313.97.6] of the Revised Code.

All students wishing to obtain tutorial assistance grants shall make application to the state superintendent by the first day of the school year in which the assistance will be used. The state superintendent shall award assistance grants in accordance with criteria the superintendent shall establish. For each student awarded a grant, the state superintendent shall also determine whether the student qualifies for seventy-five or ninety per cent of the grant amount and so notify the student. Students whose family income is at or above two hundred per cent of the maximum income level established by the state superintendent for low-income families shall qualify for seventy-five per cent of the grant amount and students whose family income is below two hundred per cent of that maximum income level shall qualify for ninety per cent of the grant amount.

(C)(1) In the case of basic scholarships, the scholarship amount shall not exceed the lesser of the tuition charges of the alternative school the scholarship recipient

attends or an amount established by the state superintendent not in excess of twenty-five hundred dollars.

(2) The state superintendent shall provide for an increase in the basic scholarship amount in the case of any student who is a mainstreamed handicapped student and shall further increase such amount in the case of any separately educated handicapped child. Such increases shall take into account the instruction, related services, and transportation costs of educating such students.

(3) In the case of tutorial assistance grants, the grant amount shall not exceed the lesser of the provider's actual charges for such assistance or a percentage established by the state superintendent, not to exceed twenty per cent, of the amount of the pilot project school district's average basic scholarship amount.

(4) No scholarship or tutorial assistance grant shall be awarded unless the state superintendent determines that twenty-five or ten per cent, as applicable, of the amount specified for such scholarship or grant pursuant to division (C)(1), (2), or (3) of this section will be furnished by a political subdivision, a private nonprofit or for profit entity, or another person. Only seventy-five or ninety per cent of such amounts, as applicable, shall be paid from state funds pursuant to section 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code.

(D)(1) Annually by the first day November, the state superintendent shall estimate the maximum per-pupil scholarship amounts for the ensuing school year. The state superintendent shall make this estimate available to the general public at the offices of the district board of education together with the forms required by division (D)(2) of this section.

(2) Annually by the fifteenth day of January, the chief administrator of each registered private school located in the pilot project district and the principal of each public school in such district shall complete a parental information form and forward it to the president of the board of education. The parental information form shall be prescribed by the department of education and shall provide information about the grade levels offered, the numbers of students, tuition amounts, proficiency examination results, and any sectarian or other organizational affiliations.

HISTORY: 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix G

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3313: BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ORC Ann. 3313.979 (Anderson 1999)

§3313.979 Payment of scholarships and grants to parents or to school district; monthly reports by private school.

Each scholarship or grant to be used for payments to a registered private school or to an approved tutorial assistance provider is payable to the parents of the student entitled to the scholarship or grant. Each scholarship to be used for payments to a public school in an adjacent school district is payable to the school district of attendance by the superintendent of public instruction.

(A)(1) By the fifteenth day of each month of the school year that any scholarship students are enrolled in a registered private school, the chief administrator of that school shall notify the state superintendent of:

(a) The number of students who were reported to the school district as having been admitted by that private school pursuant to division (A)(2)(b) of section 3313.978 [3313.97.8] of the Revised Code and who were still enrolled in the private school as of the first day of such month, and the numbers of such students who qualify for seventy-five and ninety per cent of the scholarship amount;

(b) The number of students who were reported to the school district as having been admitted by another private school pursuant to division (A)(2)(b) of section 3313.978

[3313.97.8] of the Revised Code and since the date of admission have transferred to the school providing the notification under division (A)(1) of this section, and the numbers of such students who qualify for seventy-five and ninety per cent of the scholarship amount.

(2) From time to time, the state superintendent shall make a payment to the parent of each student entitled to a scholarship. Each payment shall include for each student reported under division (A)(1) of this section, a portion of seventy-five or ninety per cent, as applicable, of the scholarship amount specified in divisions (C)(1) and (2) of section 3313.978 [3313.97.8] of the Revised Code. This amount shall be proportionately reduced in the case of any such student who is not enrolled in a registered private school for the entire school year.

(3) The first payment under this division shall be made by the last day of November and shall equal one-third of seventy-five or ninety per cent, as applicable, of the estimated total amount that will be due to the parent for the school year pursuant to division (A)(2) of this section.

(B) The state superintendent, on behalf of the parents of a scholarship student enrolled in a public school in an adjacent school district pursuant to section 3327.06 of the Revised Code, shall make the tuition payments required by that section to the school district admitting the student, except that, notwithstanding sections 3323.13, 3323.14, and 3327.06 of the Revised Code, the total payments in any school year shall not exceed seventy-five or ninety per cent, as applicable, of the scholarship amount provided in divisions (C)(1) and (2) of section 3313.978 [3313.97.8] of the Revised Code.

(C) Whenever an approved provider provides tutorial assistance to a student, the state superintendent shall pay the parent for such costs upon receipt of a statement from the parent specifying the services provided and the costs of the services, which statement shall be signed by the provider. The total payments to any parent under this division for all provider services to any individual student in any school year shall not exceed seventy-five or ninety per cent, as applicable, of the grant amount provided in division (C)(3) of section 3313.978 [3313.97.8] of the Revised Code.

HISTORY: 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix H

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3314: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

ORC Ann. 3314.01 (Anderson 1998)

§3314.01 Permission to become community school; status and general powers of community school.

(A)(1) A board of education may permit all or part of any of the schools under its control, upon request of a proposing person or group and provided the person or group meets the requirements of this chapter, to become a community school.

(2) Any person or group of individuals may propose the creation of a community school pursuant to the provisions of this chapter. No nonpublic chartered or nonchartered school in existence on January 1, 1997, is eligible to become a community school under this chapter.

(B) A community school created under this chapter is a public school, independent of any school district, and is part of the state's program of education. A community school may sue and be sued, acquire facilities as needed, contract for any services necessary for the operation of the school, and enter into contracts with a sponsor pursuant to this chapter. The governing authority of a community school may carry out any act and ensure the performance of any function that is in compliance with the Ohio Constitution, this chapter, other statutes applicable to community schools, and the contract entered into under this chapter establishing the school.

HISTORY: 147 v H 215 (Eff 6-30-97); 147 v S 55 Eff 7-1-98.

The effective date is set by section 6 of SB 55.

The provisions of §§ 50.39, 50.52, Subsection 2(B) paragraph 1 of HB 215 (147 v --) read as follows:

SECTION 50.39. By December 31, 2002, the Legislative Office of Education Oversight shall complete an evaluation of the assets and liabilities to the state's system of educational options that result from the establishment of community schools under this act. The evaluation shall at least include an assessment of any advantages to providing a greater number of educational choices to Ohio parents, any detrimental impacts on the state education system or on individual school districts, and the effects of attending community schools on the academic achievement of students.

* * *

SECTION 50.52. * * *
Subsection 2. * * *

(B) The General Assembly finds that the establishment of independent community schools throughout the state has potential desirable effects, including providing parents a choice of academic environments for their children and providing the education community with the opportunity to establish limited experimental educational programs in a deregulated setting. However, the potential effects of a statewide system of community schools could also generate some adverse results. Therefore, the General Assembly finds it advisable to establish a pilot project in the Lucas County area which will permit the operation of community schools in a limited area of the state in order to provide for the evaluation and measurement of the effects of these schools.

[Sec. 50.52.2 was amended in HB 770 (147 v --), however, division (B) was not changed.]

Appendix I

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3314: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

ORC Ann. 3314.02 (Anderson 1999)

§3314.02 Proposal for converting public school to community school; new start-up school in challenged district; preliminary agreement; contract for each school.

(A) As used in this chapter:

(1) "Sponsor" means a public entity listed in division (C)(1) of this section with which the governing authority of the proposed community school enters into a contract pursuant to this section.

(2) "Pilot project area" means the school districts included in the territory of the former community school pilot project established by former Section 50.52 of Am. Sub. H.B. No. 215 of the 122nd general assembly.

(3) "Challenged school district" means any of the following:

(a) A school district that is part of the pilot project area;

(b) A school district that is in a state of academic emergency under section 3302.03 of the Revised Code;

(c) A big eight school district;

(d) An urban school district.

(4) "Big eight school district" means a school district that for fiscal year 1997 had both of the following:

(a) A percentage of children residing in the district and participating in the predecessor of Ohio works first greater than thirty per cent, as reported pursuant to section 3317.10 of the Revised Code;

(b) An average daily membership greater than twelve thousand, as reported pursuant to former division (A) of section 3317.03 of the Revised Code.

(5) "New start-up school" means a community school other than one created by converting all or part of an existing public school, as designated in the school's contract pursuant to division (A)(17) of section 3314.03 of the Revised Code.

(6) "Urban school district" means one of the state's twenty-one urban school districts as defined in division (O) of section 3317.02 of the Revised Code as that section existed prior to July 1, 1998.

(B) Any person or group of individuals may initially propose under this division the conversion of all or a portion of a public school to a community school. The proposal shall be made to the board of education of the city, local, or exempted village school district in which the public school is proposed to be converted. Upon receipt of a proposal, a board may enter into a preliminary agreement with the person or group proposing the conversion of the public school, indicating the intention of the board of education to support the conversion to a community school. A proposing person or group that has a preliminary agreement under this division may proceed to finalize plans for the school, establish a

governing authority for the school, and negotiate a contract with the board of education. Provided the proposing person or group adheres to the preliminary agreement and all provisions of this chapter, the board of education shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a contract in accordance with section 3314.03 of the Revised Code and division (C) of this section.

(C)(1) Any person or group of individuals may propose under this division the establishment of a new start-up school to be located in a challenged school district. The proposal may be made to any of the following public entities:

(a) the board of education of the district in which the school is proposed to be located;

(b) The board of education of any joint vocational school district with territory in the county in which is located the majority of the territory of the district in which the school is proposed to be located;

(c) The board of education of any city, local, or exempted village school district having territory in the same county where the district in which the school is proposed to be located has the major portion of its territory;

(d) The state board of education;

(e) If the school is proposed to be located in the pilot project area, the governing board of the educational service center serving the county containing the majority of the territory of the pilot project area;

(f) If the school is proposed to be located in the pilot project area, a sponsoring authority designated by the board

of trustees of a state university located in the pilot project area, or the board of trustees itself.

The public entity may enter into a preliminary agreement pursuant to division (C)(2) of this section with the proposing person or group.

(2) A preliminary agreement indicates the intention of a public entity described in division (C)(1) of this section to sponsor the community school. A proposing person or group that has such a preliminary agreement may proceed to finalize plans for the school, establish a governing authority for the school, and negotiate a contract with the public entity. Provided the proposing person or group adheres to the preliminary agreement and all provisions of this chapter, the public entity shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a contract in accordance with section 3314.03 of the Revised Code.

(3) A new start-up school that is established in a school district while that district is in a state of academic emergency under section 3302.03 of the Revised Code may continue in existence once the school district is no longer in a state of academic emergency, provided there is a valid contract between the school and a sponsor.

(D) A majority vote of a sponsoring school district board and a majority vote of the members of the governing authority of a community school shall be required to adopt a contract and convert the public school to a community school or establish the new start-up school. An unlimited number of community schools may be established in any school district provided that a contract is entered into for each community school pursuant to this chapter.

HISTORY: 147 v H 215 (Eff 6-30-97); 147 v S 55 (Eff 7-1-98); 147 v H 650 (Eff 7-1-98); 148 v H 282. Eff 9-28-99.

Appendix J

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3314: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

ORC Ann. 3314.04 (Anderson 1997)

§3314.04 Exemption from state laws and rules.

Except as otherwise specified in this chapter and in the contract between a community school and a sponsor, such school is exempt from all state laws and rules pertaining to schools, school districts, and boards of education, except those laws and rules that grant certain rights to parents.

HISTORY: 147 v H 215. Eff 6-30-97.

Appendix K

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3314: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

ORC Ann. 3314.06 (Anderson 1999)

§3314.06 Admission procedures.

The governing authority of each community school established under this chapter shall adopt admission procedures that specify the following:

(A) That except as otherwise provided in this section, admission to the school shall be open to any individual age five to twenty-two entitled to attend school pursuant to section 3313.64 or 3313.65 of the Revised Code in a school district in the state.

(B) That admission to the school may be limited to students who have attained a specific grade level or are within a specific age group; to students that meet a definition of "at-risk," as defined in the contract; or to residents of a specific geographic area within the district, as defined in the contract.

(C) Whether enrollment is limited to students who reside in the district in which the school is located or is open to residents of other districts, as provided in the policy adopted pursuant to the contract.

(D) That there will be no discrimination in the admission of students to the school on the basis of race, creed, color, handicapping condition, or sex; and that, upon

admission of any handicapped student, the community school will comply with all federal and state laws regarding the education of handicapped students.

(E) That the school may not limit admission to students on the basis of intellectual ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, or athletic ability.

(F) That the community school will admit the number of students that does not exceed the capacity of the school's programs, classes, grade levels, or facilities.

(G) That, except as otherwise provided under division (B) of this section, if the number of applicants exceeds the capacity restrictions of division (F) of this section, students shall be admitted by lot from all those submitting applications, except preference shall be given to students attending the school the previous year and to students who reside in the district in which the school is located. Preference may be given to siblings of students attending the school the previous year.

Notwithstanding divisions (A) through (G) of this section, in the event the facial composition of the enrollment of the community school is violative of a federal desegregation order, the community school shall take any and all corrective measure to comply with the desegregation order.

HISTORY: 147 v H 215 (Eff 6-30-97); 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix L

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3314: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

ORC Ann. 3314.11 (Anderson 1999)

§3314.11 State office of school options.

The department of education shall establish the state office of school options to provide advice and services for the community schools program, established pursuant to Chapter 3314. of the Revised Code, and the pilot project scholarship program, established pursuant to sections 3313.974 [3313.97.4] to 3313.979 [3313.97.9] of the Revised Code. The office shall provide services that facilitate the management of the community schools program and the pilot project scholarship program, including providing technical assistance and information to persons or groups considering proposing a community school, to governing authorities of community schools, and to public entities sponsoring or considering sponsoring a community school.

HISTORY: 147 v S 55 (Eff 7-1-98); 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix M

PAGE'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED

TITLE 33 EDUCATION—LIBRARIES
CHAPTER 3314: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

ORC Ann. 3314.12 (Anderson 1999)

§3314.12 Annual composite report on community schools.

The legislative office of education oversight shall produce and issue an annual composite informational report on community schools established under this chapter to the speaker of the house of representatives, the president of the senate, and the governor. The report shall include the number of schools in operation, the size and characteristics of enrollment for the schools, the academic performance of the schools, the financial status of the schools, and any other pertinent information.

HISTORY: 147 v H 770 (Eff 7-1-98); 148 v H 282. Eff 6-29-99.

Appendix N

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
Plaintiffs	:	
	:	JUDGE SOLOMON
v.	:	OLIVER, JR.
	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:	
Defendant	:	
SUE GATTON, et al.	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
Plaintiffs	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.	:	
Defendants	:	

AFFIDAVIT OF CAROLINE M. HOXBY

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts	:	
	:	SS.
County of Middlesex	:	

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, Caroline M. Hoxby, says and deposes that she has personal knowledge of the following:

1. I am the Morris Kahn Associate Professor of Economics at Harvard University. My area of study

includes education economics, including school choice. A true and accurate copy of my current visa is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit 1.

2. I have been the principal investigator for several studies involving school choice and its economic affect on public schools. See, for example, "Analyzing School Choice Reforms Using America's Traditional Forms of Parent Choice," as it appears in the text, *Learning from School Choice*, attached hereto and incorporated herein in as Exhibit 2. See also "When Parents Can Choose, What Do They Choose? The Effects of School Choice on Curriculum," as it appears in the text, *When Schools Make A Difference*, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit 3. See also "Evidence on Private School Vouchers: Effects on Schools and Students," as it appears in the text, *Performance-Based Approaches to School Reform*, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit 4.

3. I am familiar with the Ohio Pilot Scholarship Program, which provides vouchers to scholarship recipients in the Cleveland public school system, I am also familiar with the other choice alternatives available to students in the Cleveland Public School System including magnet schools and community schools.

4. The Ohio Department of Education has supplied me with the information that the amount of money that the State of Ohio provides for each scholarship in The Cleveland Scholarship Program differs from the per-pupil amount of money that the State provides to community schools. The amount of money that the

State of Ohio provides for each scholarship in the The Cleveland Scholarship Program also differs from the per-pupil amount of money that the Cleveland public school district spends in its schools, including its magnet schools.

a. For families whose income is not more than 200% of the federal poverty line, the scholarship program provides a maximum scholarship or $2250, or 90% of private school tuition. These low-income families must pay the remaining 10% or $250.

b. For other families that participate in the scholarship program, the program provides a maximum scholarship of $1875, up to 75% of the private school's tuition. These families must pay the remaining 25% of tuition, or up to $625.

c. The State of Ohio provides to each community school in Cleveland $4518 for each student enrolled in the school. A community school may also receive special education and Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid from the State of Ohio.

d. In fiscal year 1998, the Cleveland public school district spends an average of $7,097 for each student enrolled in its schools, including its magnet schools. The State of Ohio provides $4,167 of this $7,097. Therefore, the State of Ohio provides more per pupil to the Cleveland public school district and to community schools than it provides to The Cleveland Scholarship Program.

e. In my research, I have found that parents tend to choose schools that spend more money per student, other things being equal. Moreover, I am familiar with a large and well-established body of research that shows that parents tend to choose schools that spend more money per student, other things being equal. A small sample of the literature on this subject includes: Daniel Rubinfeld and Perry Shapiro, "Micro-estimation of the Demand for Schooling: Evidence from Michigan and Massachusetts" in *Regional Science & Urban Economics*, Vol. 19 (3); Arthur Denzau and Kevin Grier, "Determinants of Local School Spending: Some Consistent Estimates," in *Public Choice*, Vol. 44 (2); Theodore Bergstrom, Daniel Rubinfeld, and Perry Shapiro, "Micro-Based Estimates of Demand Functions for Local School Expenditures." In *Econometrica*, Vol. 50 (5); Daniel Rubinfeld Perry Shapiro, and Judith Roberts, "Tiebout Bias and the Demand for Local Public Schooling," in *Review of Economics and Statistics*. Vol. 69 (3); Dennis Epple, Radu Filimon, and Thomas Romer, "Equilibrium among Local Jurisdictions: Toward an Integrated Treatment of Voting and Residential Choice," in *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 24 (3); Edward Gramlich and Daniel Rubinfeld, "Micro Estimates of Public Spending Demand Functions and Tests of the Tiebout and Median-Voter Hypotheses," in *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 90 (3); Dan Goldhaber, "An Endogenous Model of Public School Expenditures and Private School Enrollment," in *Journal of Urban*

Economics, Vol. 46 (1); Arthur Denzau, "An Empirical Survey of Studies on Public School Spending," in *National Tax Journal*, Vol. 28 (2).

f. Because the State of Ohio provides more money per pupil to the Cleveland public school districts and to community schools than it provides to The Cleveland Scholarship Program, the State of Ohio has not created a spending incentive for Cleveland parents to choose a religious private school rather than a non-religious community school, public school, or magnet school.

g. On the contrary, the fact that the State of Ohio provides more money per pupil to community schools and the Cleveland public schools (including magnet schools) than it provides to The Cleveland Scholarship Program means that parents have a spending incentive to choose a public school (community, conventional, or magnet) over a private school. If one takes account of all spending (state, local, and federal) on each student in the Cleveland public schools, parents face a strong spending incentive to choose the Cleveland public schools over private schools.

h. Given the results of my research, one would expect that many Cleveland parents who want to send their child to an independently operated school (as opposed to the public schools operated by the Cleveland school district) will choose community schools over voucher schools, especially if they receive that

the greater spending per student at community schools gives the community schools an opportunity to provide more ample educational services than the voucher schools can provide.

i. Given the greater state per-pupil spending on community schools, the State of Ohio has not created a preferential subsidy in favor of religious, independently operated schools over non-religious, independently operated schools.

j. Given the great state per-pupil spending on community schools and the Cleveland public schools (including magnet schools), the State of Ohio has not created a preferential study in favor of private schooling over public schooling.

5. Community schools in Cleveland provide a form of competition to both private schools, including those that participate in The Cleveland Scholarship Program, and conventional public schools operated by the Cleveland public school district.

a. An educational market is composed of all the schools that parents have an opportunity to choose among. In the city of Cleveland, the educational market includes conventional public schools, magnet schools, community, and voucher schools.

b. A new non-religious school (that is, one that has no religious affiliation or religious content in its curriculum) that starts up will tend to enter the market as a community school rather

than a voucher school because the per pupil government subsidy for a community school is greater than the amount of the voucher.

c. I understand that the start-up Hope schools in Cleveland have terminated their status as private schools participating in the voucher program and have reopened as new community schools. This behavior by a participant in the market confirms that spending by the State of Ohio gives non-religious start-up schools an incentive to become community schools.

d. I also understand that many parents who previously sent their children to the Hope voucher schools have chosen to enroll their children this year in the newly reorganized Hope community schools. This fact demonstrates that these parents think that non-religious, independently operated schools are at least as desirable when they are community schools as when they are voucher schools.

6. Community schools are only in their second year of operation in Cleveland. As long as the State Board of Education continues to approve new community schools, in the future one would expect to see the formation of new community schools in Cleveland if there is unmet demand for non-religious alternatives to conventional public schools operated by the local Cleveland district.

a. The evidence from Arizona and other states where charter schools have been in operation for a period of time longer than in Ohio

indicates that, as long as the government is willing to charter new schools and as long as charter school funding is somewhat commensurate with spending on conventional public schools, new schools do enter to meet parents' demands for alternative schools.

b. New community schools are particularly likely to enter at the elementary school level, where small schools can operate without experiencing unduly high costs that occur when a school has an inefficiently small scale. Compared to a high school, elementary schools need few specialized inputs. High school students benefit from access to specialized teachers and specialized equipment (such as libraries, laboratory equipment, shop equipment, and athletic facilities) so that a high school that is at minimum efficient scale is much larger than an elementary school that it is at minimum efficient scale.

c. In Cleveland, if there is an as-yet-unmet demand for non-religious, independently operated elementary schools, additional community schools are likely to enter the market to satisfy this demand. These would compete for students with both the existing voucher schools and the conventional public schools. Recall that the voucher program applies only to elementary schools.

d. Conversely, if no or few community schools entered the Cleveland educational market over the next few years (and assuming no increased

obstacles to entry from the State Department of Education), the best explanation would be that the existing community schools satisfy parents' demands for non-religious alternatives to religious, independently operated schools (such as many of the existing voucher schools).

e. More generally, if the current regulatory environment and spending patterns persist, we would expect that, over time, students who use vouchers to attend religious voucher schools would become the majority of students who use vouchers. This phenomenon would not be the consequence of a government spending incentive to choose religious schools. It would be the consequence of exactly opposite incentives: the spending incentives for parents who prefer non-religious schools to choose community schools or conventional public schools over voucher schools. If some students were to continue to use the voucher program to attend religious schools, this would be the result of their families' preferences for religious rather than non-religious schooling, not the result of any governmental incentive to choose religious voucher schools over non-religious community schools.

7. My own research tends to show that a significant effect of school choice is the effect that they have upon conventional public school districts, which have to respond to parents' having alternative school choices. The effects of school choice on *students who attend conventional public schools* are perhaps more

important than the effects on students who attend choice schools (such as voucher or community schools), simply because the number of students who benefit when conventional public schools improve is large relative to the number of students who actually attend choice schools.

a. My work has shown that suburban school districts tend to perform better in areas where there are more suburban districts available for parents to choose among.

b. Similarly, public school districts tend to provide better achievement outcomes for their students if they operate are in areas where it is easier and less expensive for parents to send their children to private schools. This is the case even with traditional private schools (that is, in the absence of any voucher program or other government subsidy for private schools). For instance, in areas where private schools have more funds from non-tuition sources (such as endowment income or donations), private schools charge less to parents and are more readily available to parents. In such areas, public school students tend to have higher achievement.

c. Because vouchers increase the ability of private schools to compete with public schools, particularly for low-income children, the available evidence suggests that one effect of vouchers will be to exert competitive pressure on public schools, giving them an incentive to improve the quality of their performance.

8. My research demonstrates that choices made by parents in this country have traditionally been an important force in determining the education their children receive. Parents are not all equally able to exercise choice. Parents with middle to high incomes routinely exercise more choice than low-income parents because they (the middle-to-high income parents) are able to choose among more school districts and private schools. Low-income and minority households are the most likely to be prevented from making reasonably optimal investments in their children's schooling because they are unable to choose among school districts when they choose their residences (either because of their budgets or housing discrimination).

9. My research also demonstrates that providing parents with choices among schools tends to increase parents' involvement in their children's schooling. Parents' influence on school policy, which is greater when choice is greater, will reflect, on average, their stated preferences for schools that foster achievement and self-discipline.

10. Because a private school is equally eligible to participate in The Cleveland Scholarship Program whether or not it includes religion in its curriculum, The Cleveland Scholarship Program does not create a financial incentive for private schools to teach religion.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Caroline M. Hoxby
CAROLINE M. HOXBY

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my this 26th day of October, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

APPENDIX O

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
Plaintiffs,	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
vs.	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:	JUDGE SOLOMON OLIVER, JR.
Defendant.	:	
SUE GATTON, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
vs.	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:	
Defendants	:	

AFFIDAVIT OF KIM METCALF

In the State of Indiana	:	ss
County of Monroe	:	

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, Kim K. Metcalf says and deposes that he has personal knowledge of the following:

1. I am Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum & Instruction School of Education, Indiana University and Director of the Indiana Center for Evaluation. As Director, I am responsible for establishing and overseeing a university sponsored center offering contract evaluation services to the state and federal agencies and non-profit organizations. I am author of many research articles, which have appeared in peer reviewed journals. A true and accurate copy of my Curriculum Vitae, which provides more detailed information regarding my professional and educational background is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

2. The Ohio Department of Education retained the Indiana Center to develop a methodology and research design for an evaluation of the pilot project scholarship program. The evaluation was to focus on a variety of factors associated with the implementation and impact of the pilot program in Cleveland. The Indiana Center was chosen after a competitive bidding process and because it demonstrated evaluative competence and objectivity and a record of neutrality on school choice and school vouchers.

3. In March, 1998, under my supervision a project report entitled a Comparative Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program, Year One 1996-1997 was issued. The report is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

4. In November, 1998, under my supervision a report entitled Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship Program Second Year Report (1997-1998), was

issued which is attached hereto as Exhibit 3. The Second Year results showed:

- The scholarship program provided additional educational options to low income, minority and single parent families.

- Students who continued in the program for at least two years are comparable to their public school peers in demographic characteristics and previous academic achievement.

- The scholarship program seems to be successfully meeting the goal of promoting educational choice without drawing only the best students from public schools.

5. On September 2, 1999, under my supervision a report entitled Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program 1996-1999, was issued, which is attached hereto as Exhibit 4.

6. The September 2, 1999 report collected data on the characteristics of scholarship families by using Cleveland Municipal School District records, scholarship office records and through extensive parent/family interviews.

7. Scholarship students share the same characteristics as the children attending public schools in the Cleveland Municipal School District. However, the parents of scholarship students are more likely to have a high school diploma and a four year college degree than parents of Cleveland public school students. Scholarship students are primarily non-white, low

income, and almost equally divided between male and female and their families are headed by a single mother.

- 73.4% of the scholarship families are non-white 60% of the non-white families are African-American.

- 70% of the households of scholarship families are headed by a single mother and the mean family income is $18,750.00.

- Scholarship families are similar to families of students attending the Cleveland public schools.

- In general, the scholarship program is serving the families for which it was intended to serve, minority families of low income. Because these students frequently live in a household headed by a single mother they are further at risk academically.

8. The majority of children who participated in the scholarship program would have been unable to enroll in a private school without a scholarship.

9. Based upon interviews conducted in the spring of the third year of the program, the study examined how and why educational choices were made by parents. The most important reasons for applying for the scholarship program were educational quality and school safety.

- 96.4% of the respondents indicated that the fact that they believed that their private schools

offered a better education than the public schools was either a very important or somewhat important reason for applying for a scholarship.

- 84.6% indicated that public schools provided a "low quality education."

- 78% reported a general dislike of the Cleveland public schools.

- 95% of the respondents indicated that a concern for their child's safety was an important reason for applying for a scholarship.

- 88.7% of the families applying for a scholarship indicated that financial reasons were very important or somewhat important in applying for a scholarship. The scholarship was the only way they could send their child to a private school.

10. There are a variety of factors utilized by scholarship winners in determining which school to enroll their children.

    - 96.6% believed that the reputation of the school was important.

    - 92.7% indicated that availability of space was important.

    - 86.4% indicated located of the school in relation to the families' residence was important.

    - 80.6% indicated that the recommendations of other people were important.

11. The least important reason of the five factors in making a private school selection was the religious affiliation of the school.

12. For a large proportion of scholarship families the scholarship program provided educational opportunities and choice that they would not otherwise have had.

13. The scholarship program provides opportunities for low income minority families, but it is also effective in ensuring that scholarships are awarded to families with the greatest need.

14. Parents of scholarship recipients reported that their children were more enthusiastic about learning than did parents of applicants/non-recipients and parents of public school students.

15. Parents of scholarship students reported participating in more activities at their child's school than did parents of public school students.

16. Parents of scholarship students have a significantly higher level of overall satisfaction with their children's schools than do public school or applicant/non-recipient parents. Scholarship parents are more satisfied with their child's teachers, more satisfied with academic standards at the child's school, more satisfied with order and discipline, more satisfied with social activities at the school, more satisfied with their child's classmates and more satisfied with the other children at the child's school.

17. A primary focus of the evaluation is the impact of the scholarship program on students' academic

achievement. A standardized test Terra Nova is administered to public and private school students throughout Cleveland. Available data indicated small, but statistically significant effects on students' achievement for scholarship students in existing private schools after two years in the program when compared to public school students in existing private schools after two years in the program when compared to public school students in language (45 versus 40) and science (40.0 versus 36.0).

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Kim Metcalf
KIM METCALF

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 26th day of October, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

APPENDIX P

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
Plaintiffs,	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
vs.	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:	JUDGE SOLOMON OLIVER, JR.
Defendant.	:	
SUE GATTON, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
vs.	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:	
Defendants	:	

AFFIDAVIT OF PAUL E. PETERSON

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts	:	ss
County of Norfolk	:	

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, Paul E. Peterson says and deposes that he has personal knowledge of the following:

This affidavit is divided into seven major parts:

1. Autobiographical information;

2. Relationship between school vouchers to other forms of school choice available in the United States and the State of Ohio.

3. Participation in voucher programs—who, why, and why not.

4. Impact of vouchers on student learning and school environment.

5. Role of religion in voucher programs.

6. Impact of vouchers on civil society.

7. Conclusions

Autobiographical Information

I am the Henry Lee Shattuck Professor of Government and the Director of the Program on Education Policy and Governance at Harvard University. I am a former Director of the Governmental Studies program at the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. I am an author or editor of several books and numerous articles about education reform, including school choice. A true and accurate copy of my curriculum vitae, which provides additional information about my educational background and activities, is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit 1.

My current research focuses on school governance questions. The Program on Education Policy and

Governance conducts research and hosts seminars and conferences on current education subjects, including the examination of alternative forms of school governance such as charter schools, magnet schools, inter-district choice programs and school vouchers. I am also the principal investigator or co-principal investigator for several evaluations of both publicly-funded and privately-funded school voucher pilot programs in the following cities: Cleveland, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; the Edgewood Independent School District in San Antonio, Texas; New York City, NY; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Washington, D.C.[1] Support for the evaluation in Cleveland which I directed was provided in part by the State of Ohio's Department of Education, and I also served as a member of the Advisory Committee to a second evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship program conducted by investigators at Indiana University. My evaluations have been published in several reports and publications; true and accurate copies of these reports and publications are attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit 2. In addition to reporting and interpreting results from my own research, I shall rely upon and refer to the results of investigations by other scholars whenever these results bear upon any inferences that I have drawn and conclusions that I have reached.

Choice and Competition in American Education

Historically, most school boards in the United States assigned students to schools by drawing boundaries that established specific attendance areas. Where one lived determined the school one attended, if one chose to attend a public school. Families did not *seem* to have any choice at all—though the reality, as we shall see, was not quite this simple.

The situation has changed substantially in recent years. Today, a wide variety of school choice mechanisms are available to parents and students—vouchers, magnet schools, charter schools, inter-district choice programs, home-schooling, tax credits and tax deductions for private tuition, and, above all, school choice through residential selection. Responding to the increasing demand by parents for greater choice among schools, states today provide a greater range of choices to parents than ever before. Approximately 63 percent of American families with school-age children are making a choice when sending their child to school. According to a 1993 Department of Education survey, 39 percent of all parents said that where they have chosen to live was influenced by the school their child would attend.[2] Another 11 percent of the population sends their children to private school.[3] And still another 13 percent of families have a choice of some kind of public school such as a magnet school, charter school, participation in an inter-district choice program or other choice program.[4]

Indeed, one can appreciate the place of the Cleveland Scholarship Program in the system of school choices available only by understanding the local and national context in which this educational innovation is embedded. This scholarship program, which I shall usually refer to as a voucher program to facilitate comparison with similar programs elsewhere, is just one example of how there has been a dramatic increase in the interest the public has expressed in finding appropriate mechanisms for enhancing competition and parental choice in American education. Currently, choice programs are rapidly expanding in size and number, and the topic has become a matter of significant public discussion and debate, with most public opinion studies finding increased demand for school choice, especially among citizens from low-income and minority backgrounds.[5]

II.A. Origins of the Choice Concept in Education

The extended and explicit practice of school choice in the United States came of age only in the late 1980s and early 1990s. But choice in education is an ancient concept, dating back to the days when Socrates and his fellow philosophers walked the Athenian Agora, teaching for a fee.[6] The earliest forms of choice left education strictly to the private market. It was John Stuart Mill who first made a fully developed argument on behalf of school choice within the context of publicly-funded, universal education: "Is it not almost a self-evident axiom, that the State should require and compel the education ... of every human being who is born its citizen?" he asks. He then goes on to point out that were the duty of enforcing universal education once admitted, there would be an end to the difficulties about what the State should teach, and how it should teach, which now convert the subject into a mere battlefield for sects and parties, causing the time and labor which should have been spent in educating, to be wasted in quarreling about education.... It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with helping to pay the school fees.[7]

In the United States school choice within a system of publicly-funded, universal education is first seriously broached by economist Milton Friedman, who in 1955 argued that a voucher-like arrangement where the government finances the education but families choose the school would lead to a more efficient educational system.[8] Published in an obscure collection, the argument rested until the early 1970s, when the Office of Economic Opportunity helped fund a school choice experiment in a the Alum Rock school district in California. When this experiment encountered strong opposition from teacher organizations and failed to be implemented effectively,[9] enthusiasm for school choice waned for about a decade, except for sporadic

use of the magnet-school concept as a tool for school desegregation.

So as late as 1980 there was very little in the way of explicit choice mechanisms within the publicly-funded sector of American education (other than choice by means of residential selection, as discussed below). Then, in the 1980s and early 1990s, a number of events helped give the school-choice movement new impetus. First, a major study by a research team headed by James Coleman (discussed more fully below) reported that students in Catholic schools outperformed their public-school peers. These findings were subsequently supported by a second major study by the Brookings Institution that in addition explained the original results by showing that private schools had more autonomy and, as a result, were organized more effectively than public schools.[10] The authors, John Chubb and Terry Moe, proposed school vouchers as the solution. Although critics questioned both studies, their impact was reinforced by a Department of Education proposal to give compensatory education funds directly to low-income families to be used as vouchers.[11] At the same time, experiments that gave families greater choice of public school began to appear in Minnesota, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and East Harlem. When test-score gains were reported for East Harlem, public interest in the idea grew rapidly, producing today a wide variety and ever-growing set of school-choice initiatives.[12] What had been the gleam in the eye of a few intellectuals in 1970 had become by the end of the century, a major political movement with a wide variety of actual policies operating in many parts of the United States.

II.B. Residential Location and School Choice

Still, one can only understand the new interest in school choice by placing in the context of the oldest form of

school choice in the publicly-funded sector of American education, the opportunity families have to choose a school by locating in a particular community. Although it has not always been recognized by interpreters of the American system of education, self-conscious school choice has always been exercised by many families when they rent or purchase a house in a place where they think the school is good. Because the quality of the school affects a family's residential decisions, housing prices vary with the quality of local schools. As a result, many families indirectly pay for their children's education by purchasing homes that cost more, simply because the home is located in a neighborhood which is perceived to have a higher-quality school.[13]

School choice by residential selection is highly inegalitarian, especially when one considers that the purchase of a home requires a capital investment. As school quality drives up housing prices, access to the neighborhood school is determined by one's capacity to obtain a mortgage. Those with higher earning power and more capital resources are able to command access to the best schools.

School choice by residential selection, the most inegalitarian form of school choice, is becoming more widespread, simply because more families have more choice in selecting a neighborhood in which to live than ever before. A half century ago, the attractiveness—and thus the average cost (per square foot)—of a residential location was strongly influenced by its proximity to workplaces, which were concentrated in specific parts of a metropolitan area, primarily the central city. But when highways replaced railroads and rapid transit systems as the primary mode of transport in metropolitan areas, employment opportunities diffused throughout the metropolitan area. Once jobs became widely distributed, the dominant factors affecting community housing prices became local amenities, such as

the neighborhood school.[14] By 1993, 39 percent of families said they considered the local school when selecting a place to live.[15]

The amount of school choice by residential selection varies across metropolitan areas. In the Miami metropolitan area, for example, this form of choice is restricted by the fact that one school district is responsible for almost the entire metropolitan area, whereas the Boston metropolitan area is divided into over one hundred school districts. There are thirty-one school districts in Cuyahoga county, the county that constitutes much of the Cleveland metropolitan area. Still additional school districts are located in adjacent counties that are also considered a part of the Cleveland metropolis.

The quality of education is higher in metropolitan areas that give parents more choice by virtue of the fact that they have more school districts. Students take more academic courses, students spend more time on their homework, classes are more structured and disciplined, parents are more involved with schools, student test scores are higher, and sports programs are given less emphasis.[16]

It is difficult for low-income families to exercise choice through residential selection. Most do not have the earning power nor access to financial markets to locate in neighborhoods with schools perceived to be of high quality. On the contrary, they often can afford a home or apartment only because it is located in a neighborhood where schools are perceived to be of low quality, a perception that depresses property values. In short, in a system of residentially-determined school choice, such as exists in most metropolitan areas today, low-income families are very likely to be concentrated in areas where schools are thought to be of low quality. Conversely and ironically, once a neighborhood

school serving a low-income community improves, local land values will rise, making it more difficult for additional poor families to gain access to the school.

It was precisely this link between school and residence that provoked one of the most turbulent periods in American educational history, the school busing controversy. Since school choice by residential selection gave better-off families access to better schools, many felt that racial segregation and inequality could be obtained only by forcefully breaking the link between school and residence by compelling families to send their children by bus to schools distant from their place of residence.[17]

II.C. Magnet schools

So unpopular was compulsory busing with many Americans from all ethnic backgrounds that the magnet school, exploiting the choice concept, was developed to replace it. Magnet schools sought to increase racial and ethnic integration of schools by enticing families to choose integrated schools by offering distinctive, improved education programs. The magnet idea was initially broached in the 1960s. But it was not until after 1984 that the magnet-school concept, now supported by federal funding under the Magnet Schools Assistance program, began to have a national impact. "Between 1984 and 1994, 138 districts nationwide received a total of $955 million" in federal funds to implement this form of school choice.[18] As a consequence, the number of schools with magnet programs doubled between 1982 and 1991, while the number of students tripled.[19] In some school districts, parents can choose a magnet school only if their choice increases the level of racial integration within the magnet school. In other school districts, magnet school places are offered on a first-come, first-served basis. In still other school districts,

schools that are highly magnetic must choose students by means of a lottery. Nationwide, in the early 1990s, over 1.2 million students attended 2,400 magnet schools in over 200 school districts.[20]

In Cleveland, magnet schools were introduced on a widespread scale in response to court orders requiring that Cleveland schools be desegregated. In 1981, the federal district court issued an order that explicitly called for the establishment of magnet schools, and a number of magnet schools were established over the subsequent decade. In 1994 the City of Cleveland and the State of Ohio agreed to a plan that would "enlarge the capacity of its magnet schools from 6,800 seats in 1992-93 to approximately 12,800 seats by the 1994-95 school year."[21] In the 1999-2000 school year 23 magnet schools were expected to enroll well over 10,000 students in kindergarten through eighth grade.

The magnet school concept, if taken to its logical conclusion, opens all the public schools in a district to all families, allowing them to select their preferred public school, subject to space constraints. Such programs, generally identified as open-enrollment programs, can be found at the high school and middle school levels in a few school districts.

Most studies of the effects of magnet schools and open-enrollment programs find positive effects on student learning.[22] Although some of these findings have been questioned on the grounds that the apparent effects were simply a function of the initial ability of the students selected to attend magnet schools,[23] two studies that carefully addressed this issue still found positive effects from attendance at a magnet school.[24]

II.D. Inter-district school choice

If most magnet-school programs limit parental choice to public schools within a particular school district, in a number of places school choice has been expanded to include access to public institutions outside the local school district. As early as 1985, Minnesota gave local school boards permission to allow students from outside their district to attend their school (but the program was restricted to students who would not adversely affect the racial integration of participating school districts).[25] By 1997 nearly 20,000 students were participating.[26] In 1966, Massachusetts enacted a program that allowed minority students to exit the Boston schools and enter participating suburban schools, then in 1991 enacted a more general inter-district choice program without regard to a student's ethnicity or a district's racial composition.[27] By 1995 nearly 7,000 students and over 300 school districts were participating in this program. By 1997 similar programs had been enacted in sixteen states.

Although many of these programs are too new to enable researchers to draw conclusions about their long-term effect, preliminary evidence from the Massachusetts program indicates that the students participating in the programs enacted in that state are ethnically representative of the student composition of the public schools more generally. Also, it appears that school districts losing students often make significant efforts to upgrade their curriculum in order to staunch the flow of students outside the district.[28]

II.E. Charter Schools

Magnet schools and inter-district enrollment programs limit parental choice to schools operated by school boards. Charter schools have enlarged choice opportunities so as to include government-financed schools operated by

non-governmental entities. By 1998 thirty-four states and the District of Columbia had enacted charter-school legislation, and more than 1,199 charter schools were educating over a quarter million students.[29] At the beginning of the 1999 school year the number of charter schools had increased 40 percent, to 1,684—a notable increment by any criterion.[30] Although the percentage of students in charter schools nationwide is still a small fraction of all students, in some states charter schools are providing the school of choice for a significant fraction of the student population. For example, in 1997, 4.4 percent of the students in Arizona were attending charter schools.[31]

Charter school terminology varies by state, as does the legal framework under which these schools operate. The common characteristics of charter schools are two-fold: First, the entity operating the school is ordinarily not a government agency, though it may receive most of its operating revenue from either the state or a local school board. Second, charter schools do not serve students within a specific attendance boundary; instead they recruit students from a large catchment area that may be beyond the attendance boundaries of traditional public schools. As a result, they must persuade parents that their offerings are superior to those provided by traditional public schools in their vicinity.

The State of Ohio has enacted charter legislation establishing what the State calls "community" schools. In Cleveland, ten community schools are in operation for the 1999-2000 school year, eight of them serving elementary school students. The schools are eventually projected to enroll over 1,500 students, and additional community schools are in the process of being formed.

For the 1999-2000 school year, the community schools in Cleveland are to receive $4,518 per student. In most states, charter schools receive an amount that is roughly equivalent to the average expenditure per pupil in the state or local district. However, most charter schools must obtain capital funding to cover start-up costs from other sources.

Studies of charter schools find that, on average and taken as a whole, students attending charter schools are fairly representative of the school population more generally.[32] Most charter schools are popular with parents and substantially oversubscribed, though some charter schools have been closed because safety and education standards are subnormal. Charter schools are better able than traditional public schools to attract teachers who were educated at selective colleges and who have received higher education in mathematics and science.[33] Whether or not students learn more in charter schools than traditional public schools has yet to be ascertained by an independent research team.

II.F. Tax Deductions/Credits for Private Education

Recently, two states—Minnesota and Arizona—have facilitated parental access to private schools by providing tax deductions or tax credits that can be used to help pay the cost of private education. In Minnesota, families earning under $33,500 per year can claim a tax credit of up to $1,000 per child ($2,000 per family) for school-related expenses, including costs incurred in attending a private school such as the purchase of books and other educational materials—although a credit cannot be claimed for private school tuition. Any family can claim a tax deduction for educational expenses of up to $1,625 for students in kindergarten through sixth grade and $2,500 for students in seventh grade through high school. Private school tuition counts toward the deduction.[34] Demonstrating its popularity, 37,951

Minnesotans claimed the tax credit in 1998, averaging $371 per credit. (Information on the deduction is not available at this writing.)[35] In Arizona, any person may receive a tax credit of up to $500, if they contribute to a foundation that is providing scholarships to students attending private schools. Again, this program has proven popular, with 5,100 Arizonans claiming the credit.[36] If this practice should spread to other states, it is possible that the growth in the numbers of students attending private school might increase in future years.

Although research on the operations of these recently-enacted programs is not, to my knowledge, yet available, other information about the place of private schools in the U.S. educational system is extensive, because the presence of private schools constitutes the oldest form of school choice—dating back to before the Constitution was ratified. At that time, education was privately provided, mainly be schools that had a religious affiliation. Those who wanted to enhance educational opportunity sought to do so by means of voucher-like arrangements. For example, when the radical populist, Thomas Paine, proposed a more egalitarian system of education, he recommended a system of vouchers: Government should provide monies to parents, he said, so that they could send their children "to school, to learn reading, writing and common arithmetic; the ministers of every parish, of every denomination to certify ... that the duty is performed."[37]

State-operated schools were constructed in the United States only many decades later—largely in response to the migration of poor Catholics from Ireland and Germany into the large cities of the Northeast in the 1840s. In 1852 the Boston School Committee urged that "in our schools they [the foreign-born children] must receive moral and religious teaching, powerful enough if possible to keep them in the

right path amid the moral darkness which is their daily and domestic walk." Horace Mann, the first secretary of education for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, explained the need for public schools in the following terms: "How shall the rising generation be brought under purer moral influences" so that "when they become men, they will surpass their predecessors, both in the soundness of their speculations and in the rectitude of their practice?" When Mann established public schools in Massachusetts, the new institutions won praise from the Congregational journal, *New Englander*, which excitedly exclaimed in language that anticipated the phrasing (if not quite the sentiments) of the Gettysburg Address: "these schools draw in the children of alien parentage ... and assimilate them to the native born... So they grow up with the state, of the state, and for the state."[38]

Over the ensuing decades, public schools grew rapidly, and the share of the population attending private schools shrunk substantially. In some states—most notably, Nebraska and Oregon—the state legislature attempted to consolidate state power over the education of children by closing private schools, but key Supreme Court decisions declared such actions unconstitutional.[39] Nonetheless, the share of the population educated in private schools dropped steadily throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century until by 1959 the percentage of students attending private school was but 12.8 percent and by 1969 as low as 9.3 percent.

After reaching this nadir, the place of the private school began to stabilize and edge back upwards. By 1980, 11.5 percent of students in kindergarten through twelfth grade were attending private schools, a number that has stayed relatively constant since then.[40] Families who could afford the cost of private education were increasingly

reaching the conclusion that they needed to consider an alternative to what was being provided by the public sector.

The image of private education held by some is of an expensive day school catering to well-to-do families or an exclusive boarding school attended by college-bound "preppies." The reality is quite different. Most private schools have a religious affiliation, modest tuition, and limited facilities. Nationwide, the average private school expenditures per pupil in 1993-94 were estimated at $3,116, considerably less than public school expenditure per pupil, which was $6,653.[41]

Inasmuch as private schools have fewer fiscal resources, for many years it was generally believed that the education provided by these schools was, on average, inferior to the education provided by public schools. As a result, researchers and policy makers were surprised when a national study, funded by the U.S. Office of Education, undertaken by a research team headed by the well-known, reputable sociologist, James Coleman (later elected president of the American Sociological Association), found that students attending Catholic schools outperformed public school students.[42] This result was obtained even after Coleman and his colleagues took into account family background characteristics which also affect school performance.

Coleman's findings were so surprising and upsetting that they were subjected to careful scrutiny. Many methodological issues were raised, and numerous similar studies have subsequently been undertaken. Some scholars continue to find that students learn more in Catholic and other private schools; other scholars do not detect any differences.[43] Two conclusions may be drawn from the literature, taken as a whole: 1) Students, on average, learn at

least as much (or more) in Catholic schools. 2) While it is not altogether clear whether middle-class students learn more in Catholic schools, low-income, minority students clearly do. For this segment of the population, there is a definite advantage that comes from attending a private school.[44]

Where access to private schools is more readily available, their presence seems to provide desirable competition that spurs a positive response from public schools: The test scores of public-school students are higher, the likelihood that public-school students will attend college increases, and the wages they earn later in life are higher.[45]

II.G. Home schooling

Home-schooling constitutes one of the more rapidly growing segments of the American education systems. Although home-schooling has an enviable historic reputation—Abraham Lincoln was home-schooled, and so were Theodore and Franklin Delano Roosevelt—as late as 1980 only three states explicitly sanctioned this practice. But between 1982 and 1992, thirty-two states changed their compulsory school attendance rules so as to specifically allow families, under certain conditions, to education their children at home.[46] But in recent years it has grown rapidly. The full size and extent of home schooling is unknown; estimates of the number of students who are home-schooled vary between a half million and 1.2 million.[47] Despite the fact that at least one study suggests that home-schoolers are learning more than schooled students,[48] the recent growth in home-schooling has generated a good deal of controversy. When a charter school in California offered its services to home-schooled students by means of the Internet, the state legislature passed a law limiting the practice to students within the county and adjacent counties.[49] Nonetheless, as the Internet's educational potential is more fully exploited, it

is likely to give further impetus to the home-schooling movement.

II.H. Voucher programs

Residential selection, magnet school, inter-district enrollment, private schools and charter schools are mechanisms that provide options to a wide range of groups, but, on balance, these options, when taken together, tend to give more choice to middle than low-income families. Vouchers, as currently designed and operated, serve almost exclusively a low-income population. In this respect, they provide in a few places a significant, egalitarian complement to other choice programs by offering choice opportunities to those that otherwise hav . none.

The initial voucher program was established in Milwaukee in 1990. Since then, two major types of voucher programs have come into being—publicly-funded and privately-funded.

II.H.1. Publicly-funded voucher programs.

The three publicly funded voucher programs are to be found in Cleveland, Milwaukee, and the State of Florida. In Cleveland, students began matriculation in private schools in the fall of 1996; in the fall of 1999 the number of participating students was nearly 4,000 students. In 1999 students received a scholarship of up to $2,250, substantially less than the amount spent per student by Cleveland public schools or the amount provided to students at community schools.

The Milwaukee program, initially established in 1990, originally allowed students to attend schools without a religious affiliation. Only a few hundred students

participated in the program in its first year. In the 1998-99 school year, the program was expanded to include religious schools, and the number of participating students increased to nearly 6,000. In that year participating students received a scholarship or voucher of up to nearly $5,000.[50] A fairly small number of students became eligible for participation in the Florida program for the first time in the fall of 1999; however, the program is expected to expand substantially in the next few years. In 1999 participating students could receive a scholarship or voucher of up to $3,389.[51] All three of the publicly-funded programs are designed in such a way that students are to be selected by means of a lottery, if the number of applicants exceeds the number of school spaces available.

II.H.2. Privately-funded voucher programs.

In the United States, the private sector often plays a major role in social experimentation. Ideas that are initially too untried and controversial for governments to attempt will often be explored by private or non-profit entities, with the sponsorship of tax-exempt private foundations. The Ford Foundation sponsored the "gray areas" program that became the model for the community action program of the war on poverty established in 1965.[52] Results from evaluations of privately funded pre-school programs provided the impetus for Head Start. Privately-funded services for disabled students antedated and facilitated the design of the federally-funded special education program enacted in 1975.[53] In all cases, privately-funded programs provided important information to policy makers about the potential value of a social innovation.

Learning about school vouchers is taking place in much the same way. Several privately-funded voucher programs are currently providing valuable information about

the way in which voucher programs operate in practice. These privately-funded voucher programs differ from traditional scholarship programs in two important ways. First, the offer of the voucher to students is not conditioned on student performance. If more applications are received than can be funded by resources available to the private foundation sponsoring the program, the vouchers are distributed either by means of a lottery or on a first-come, first-served basis. Second, the scholarship is not tied to a particular school or religious denomination. Instead, the family may choose from among a wide variety of participating secular or parochial schools with any one of a multiplicity of religious affiliations. In these ways, the private programs are approximations of what is developing in the public sector.

The privately-funded voucher programs that have been studied by independent research teams are located in Dayton, the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, Indianapolis, New York City, and Washington, D.C. The major characteristics of these programs as well as the Milwaukee and Cleveland programs are described in Table 1. (Exhibit 3.)[54]

II.J. Relationships among School-Choice Programs

One cannot understand the full range of school choices available to families apart from an appreciation of the relationships among the wide variety of programs and policies that have been outlined. In every state, families have some choice of school, even if it is limited to paying for a private education or choosing to live in a neighborhood served by a school the family thinks desirable. In Many metropolitan areas, including Cleveland, families have a choice among magnet schools, charter schools (designated as community schools in Ohio), and a voucher program—as

well as selecting a neighborhood of choice or paying for a private school.

When several programs are located in the same place, they can affect one another in important ways. Schools that once participated in a voucher program may establish themselves as charter schools, perhaps because charter-school funding generally exceeds state funding under voucher programs.[55] Parents with students in private schools may decide to save money by enrolling their child in charter schools instead.

All of these choice programs provide traditional public schools an incentive to modify their practices in such a way as to maintain their enrollments—and the per pupil state aid that they have previously received. Already, there is some evidence that the availability of school vouchers is affecting public-school policies and practices. In the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, Texas, for example, the local school board accepted the resignation of its superintendent and, in a reversal of an earlier decision, established a school-uniform policy.[56] In Florida, the first two schools judged to be failing by the state—and therefore placed immediately in the voucher program—made significant policy changes after receiving their ignominious designation. One school introduced uniforms, a new phonics reading program, and class-size reduction in kindergarten; the other introduced Saturday and after-school tutoring sessions and had school staff visit parents at home to discourage truancy. Both schools have begun to focus on the basics of reading, writing, and math, in part by hiring more full-time reading and writing specialists.[57]

Within a year of the enlargement of the voucher program in Milwaukee, a new school board, elected in a hotly contested race, accepted the resignation of the school

superintendent and announced its determination to respond to the challenges provided by the new choice arrangements. In Albany, New York, all the students at a particular elementary school (deemed to have the lowest scores in the city) were offered a voucher by a private individual; the school board responded by changing the principal, the teaching staff and the curriculum.

More systematic evidence is available from ongoing research on other choice experiments. According to a study of the impact of charter schools on traditional public schools in Arizona, "districts that have lost large numbers of children to charter schools make efforts to win those children back. Sometimes those efforts pay off."[58] Similarly, in Massachusetts, districts losing students to inter-district programs are making efforts to retain their student body, with some apparent success.[59]

These are only preliminary pieces of information. It is not yet possible to know how this ferment in American education, which is undoubtedly giving families greater choice than previously available, will affect education policy and governance in the long run. Nor do we know for certain how school choice will affect students and families in the long run. It is important to continue to try out the full range of school options in a variety of contexts in order to determine which, if any, may benefit students and their families in the long term. Nonetheless, an increasing amount of information is already available on the kinds of individuals who participate in voucher programs, the quality of the schools voucher students attend, the effects of vouchers on student learning, the effects on the relationships between vouchers and religious institutions, and the effects of school vouchers on civil society. It is to these topics that the remainder of this affidavit is devoted.

Participation in Voucher Programs

Critics of school vouchers have argued that only more advantaged families will apply for vouchers and that private schools will select out only the best and the brightest students. They have also suggested that low-income families will not have good education reasons for choosing a school. Evaluations of both publicly-funded and privately-funded voucher programs now provide us with information on these topics.

III.A. Description of Evaluations

The information reported in this and subsequent parts of the report come from both Cleveland and other voucher programs. I report results from investigations in which I have participated as well as from studies by other investigators.

III.A.1. Cleveland evaluations.

The evaluations of the Cleveland voucher program which my colleagues and I conducted are primarily based on two telephone surveys of parents. The first was conducted in the summer of 1997 after the voucher program had been in effect for one year.[60] This evaluation sought to capitalize on the fact that more families had applied for a Cleveland scholarship than could be granted a scholarship under the terms of the legislation creating the program. As a result, one could compare those who received a voucher and made use of it to attend a participating private school with those who applied, but did not use a voucher. Using a telephone survey, we obtained information from random samples of these two groups of parents.

One year later, in the summer of 1998, we conducted a second wave of interviews.[61] This time we compared the responses of this group of parents with those of a random sample of all low-income families with children in public schools in the same grades as those eligible for vouchers.

In addition to the surveys of parents, the evaluations also include the results of analyses of test-score data provided to us in 1997 and 1998 by the administrators of the Hope schools, two of the schools that participated in Cleveland's voucher program during its initials years. In the summer of 1999 the Hope schools closed, and the administration created community schools in their stead.

A separate investigation of the Cleveland scholarship program was conducted by an evaluation team from the School of Education at Indiana University. Its findings are also reported whenever they bear on the particular topic at hand.[62] Additional data collection and methodological information is provided in the endnotes.

III.A.2. Evaluations of other voucher programs.

In addition to the evaluation of the Cleveland scholarship program, studies have been conducted on the Milwaukee voucher program and four privately-funded voucher programs located in the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, Texas, New York City, Washington, D.C. and Dayton, Ohio. Each of the six programs is operated differently and has been in place for differing lengths of time, and the design of the evaluation varies from place to place. As a result, the nature and quality of the information available differs among these cities. In the remainder of the essay, we will provide information from each city whenever relevant data are available. Data collection and

methodological information on these evaluations are provided in the endnotes.

III.B. Characteristics of Scholarship Recipients

Critics say that voucher programs will "cream" or "cherry-pick" the public schools, attracting the participation of the most talented students and the higher-income, better educated families. As a consequence, public schools will be left with an increasingly difficult population to educate and without the support of informed, engaged parents. Defenders of vouchers have replied that families have little incentive to move their child from one school to another, if the child is already doing well in school.[63]

Considerable information is now available on the types of students and families who participate in means-tested voucher programs such as the one currently operating in Cleveland. In general, there is little evidence that voucher programs either skim the best and brightest students from public schools or attract only the lowest-performing students. On the contrary, voucher recipients resemble a cross-section of public-school students, though in some cases they may come from somewhat more educated families.

III.B.1. Cleveland findings.

In Cleveland, first-year scholarship recipients did not differ substantially from applicants who in the end did not use a scholarship but remained in public schools. Voucher recipients, on average, actually had lower incomes. The educational background of the mothers of recipients did not differ from those remaining in a public school. They were about equally likely to be employed full time.[64]

Neither was there much evidence of skimming when parents of voucher recipients attending private schools in the second year of the Cleveland program (1997-98) were compared to a cross-section of all low-income parents with children in the same grades in Cleveland's public schools. The evaluation found the parents of students with vouchers to be of lower income and the mothers more likely to be African American than a random sample of public-school parents. Mothers had less than a year's worth of additional education beyond that of the public-school mothers, and they were not significantly more likely to be employed full-time.[65]

Nor were the students themselves the "best and the brightest." On the contrary, students with vouchers were less likely to have been in a program for gifted or talented students than were children remaining in public schools. However, students with vouchers were less likely to have a learning disability.[66]

Similar findings were obtained by the evaluation of the Cleveland scholarship program undertaken by the Indiana University's School of Education, which found that "scholarship [voucher] students, like their families, are very similar to their public-school counterparts." According to the results from this investigation, voucher recipients, on average, had lower family incomes and were more likely to be headed by a single mother. However, they found that voucher parents were less likely to be from a minority background than public-school parents. Mothers of voucher students were somewhat more likely than public-school mothers to have completed high school.[67]

III.B.2. Findings from evaluations of other voucher programs.

Nor can one find much evidence of "skimming" the best and brightest from the public schools in other cities. In Edgewood school district in San Antonio, Texas, vouchers were offered to all low-income residents. Those who accepted the vouchers had math scores which, upon beginning their new private school, were similar to those of students in public schools. Reading scores were only modestly higher. Voucher students were no more likely to have been in programs for gifted students, though they were less likely to have been in special education. Household income was similar, as was the percentage of families with two parents in the household. Mothers of voucher recipients had, on average, an additional year of education.[68]

In New York City, the household income of those who applied for participation in the lottery that selected voucher winners did not differ significantly from all those eligible to participate. They were slightly more likely to be African American and slightly more likely to be receiving welfare assistance. The probability that fathers were employed did not differ significantly between applicants and those eligible. Nor was there a significant difference in the probability that parents would be working full-time. However, mothers of those applying for a voucher were more likely to have received a college education.[69]

Not all of those who received the offer of a voucher in New York City accepted, providing another opportunity to ascertain which families are most likely to make use of the voucher opportunity. When voucher users and voucher non-users were compared, it was found that the test scores in reading and math of the two groups did not differ significantly at the time of application to the voucher

program. Voucher users were more likely to be African American and less likely to be white. The household annual income of voucher users was only slightly higher ($10,500 as compared to $8,500), and mothers were only moderately more likely to have had some college education (55 percent versus 46 percent).[70]

III.C. Reasons for Accepting a Voucher and Attending Private School

Just as concerns about "skimming" or "cherry-picking" have been voiced in voucher debates, so have questions been raised about the motivations of voucher participants. Some have said that educational concerns would not be the primary motivations for participation of low-income parents. Instead, they are likely to choose a private school over a public school for such non-educational reasons as religion, or to have the child attend a school with friends, or to secure a school that is conveniently located. In the words of one group of critics, "when parents do select another school, academic concerns are not central to the decision."[71] Writer Nicholas Lemann made much the same point more provocatively: When a major impediment to the achievement of poor children is "their parents' impoverishment, poor education, lax discipline and scant interest in education," he argued, it is absurd to think that these same parents will become "tough, savvy demanding education consumers" once they have the right to choose.[72]

III.C.1. Cleveland findings.

To ascertain the reasons parents themselves gave for participating in the scholarship program, Cleveland parents were asked to indicate from among a number of reasons which were very important for their decision to apply for a voucher. (Parents could say that any or all of the reasons

were very important to them.) The reason most frequently stated to be very important was the academic quality of their child's education. Eighty-five percent of the parents of a child not previously in a private school said this consideration was very important to them. Second in importance was the greater safety to be found at choice schools, a reason identified as very important by 79 percent of the recipients. Location was ranked third, and religion was ranked fourth.[73]

The Indiana University evaluation of the Cleveland voucher program also found that "the most important reasons for applying to the scholarship program were educational quality and school safety."[74] The Indiana team also asked parents the importance of five factors relevant to their choice of school: reputation of the school, availability of space, location, recommendations of other people and religion. Of the five factors, "religion was the least important reason for their private school selection."[75]

III.C.2. Findings from evaluations of other voucher programs.

To determine what was absolutely paramount in the minds of voucher participants, parents in the Edgewood school district in San Antonio were asked to give the single most important reason for their choice of private school. Nearly 60 percent of parents accepting vouchers said "academic quality," "teacher quality" or "what was taught in class" was the single most important reason.[76] In New York City, parents who received vouchers were asked which considerations were very important for their choice of school. The six reasons most frequently mentioned were teacher quality, what is taught in class, safety, school discipline, school quality and class size. Religious instruction was seventh on the list, convenient location was ninth, and the

sports program and a school where a child's friend was attending were tied at the bottom of the list.[77]

III.D. Reasons for not using a voucher

Critics of school vouchers argued that low-income families will not be able to find the school of their choice, because private schools will refuse to admit them for academic reasons or because they are not members of the religious group with which the school is affiliated.[78] Defenders say that private schools open their doors to a wide range of students.

When parents themselves are asked about their reasons for not making use of a voucher, they provide a wide range of explanations for their decision. Most parents said that they found a school they wanted their child to attend. Only a tiny percentage of those who do not find the school of their choice said that it was due to the fact that they were not a member of the religious group with which the school is affiliated.

III.D.1. Cleveland Results.

In Cleveland the statute requires that lotteries be used to allocate the vouchers. If more students in a given category apply for vouchers than are available, a lottery is used to determine the voucher recipients. If more students apply for admission to a particular school than can be admitted, the school must choose among applicants by means of a lottery.[79] Our survey of parents indicates that the admission practices actually in place seem to conform to these legislative requirements. Those parents who applied for the program in its initial year but in the end did not make use of the voucher, despite the fact that they had been notified that they could receive one, were asked why they chose not to

participate in the program. They were invited to give many different reasons, if they felt it was appropriate. The three reasons most frequently mentioned were as follows: 1) transportation costs (the program had problems with transportation during its initial year); 2) the child had obtained admission to a desired public school (as mentioned above, Cleveland public schools offer a number of magnet schools and programs); and 3) financial considerations (inasmuch as the voucher did not cover the full cost of private schooling). The fourth most frequently mentioned reasons was that the family was unable to obtain admission to their desired private school.[80] The results from the Indiana University evaluation in Cleveland were similar: Families who were offered but did not use a scholarship chose not to do so for a variety of reason. The reason given most frequently was that they discovered that their household income was too high for them to be eligible. Others said they were notified too late to make use of the scholarship or didn't'' recall having been notified at all; they were concerned about the private school's capacity to serve a child with special needs; transportation problems; lack of space in the school they preferred; or inadequate financial reasons. There is little evidence from either evaluation that students were excluded for religious reasons.[81]

III.D.2. Results from other Voucher Evaluations.

In New York City 72 percent of the families who were offered a voucher said they were able to attend a school the family preferred. Families could given multiple reasons for not finding the school of their choice. The reason parents most frequently offered (by 15 percent of the parents) was the cost of the school—the privately-funded voucher in New York was only $1,400, which was significantly less than the tuition charged by most private schools. Other reasons, in order of importance, were as follows: no space available (7

percent), applied too late (5 percent), transportation problems (4 percent), child not given space (4 percent), school location (3 percent), child failed admission test (2 percent), and child not a member of the church with which the school is affiliated, a reason given by just one percent of the families offered a scholarship.[82]

In the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, a random sample of all public school parents were asked why they had not applied for a voucher, even though they were eligible.[83] Three-fourths of the public-school families said they were already sending their child to the school they preferred, indicating that they chose to remain within the public-school system. Seventeen percent said they lived outside the boundaries of their preferred school, which seems to imply that these public-school families would prefer another public school but did not live in the appropriate neighborhood. Eight percent said they could not afford to send their child to their preferred school, 6 percent said they could not pay transportation costs, and 3 percent said they were not a member of the church with which the school was affiliated.[84]

School Quality and Student Learning

Proponents of school vouchers expect that schools will perform better—and students will learn more—if families can choose their children's schools. There will be a better match between the students' needs and the schools' characteristics. A stronger identification between family and school will be realized. Competition among schools will spur each to higher levels of performance. Critics of vouchers say that student performance is mainly a function of a child's family background, and that little can be gained by giving families a greater choice among alternatives.

Preliminary information on these questions can be obtained both by examining student test scores and by examining the quality of the school experience, including discipline within school, the amount of homework the student is doing, the communications between home and school, suspension and school-mobility rates, and the level of parental satisfaction with the school. In general, the information suggests that vouchers enhance the school experience of students by giving them a more structured school environment, engaging them in more homework, enhancing communication between home and school, and raising the level of parental satisfaction with the school. Students with vouchers do at least as well—and perhaps better—than students in public schools.

IV.A. Test Scores

The debate over student achievement is likely to continue for some years to come, not only because it is very difficult to measure how much children are learning in school, but also because different groups and individuals have different views as to what in fact *should* be learned in school. But on some matters, the evidence produced thus far is quite substantial: According to test-score results, students who receive vouchers seem to learn at least as much in private schools as their public school counterparts. Some studies reach even stronger conclusions, indicating that students who use vouchers to attend private school achieve higher test scores.

IV.A.1. Cleveland results.

Evidence with respect to test-score performance in Cleveland comes from studies by two research teams, one that I have directed, the other by an evaluation team at the School of Education at Indiana University. Although the

findings from the two studies differ in some respects, both find positive test-score effects from participating in the voucher program.

The central component of the Indiana University study was a two-year evaluation of the performance of students who had used a voucher to enter Grade 3 in established private schools in the fall of 1996. (One-year results from two newly established schools, the Hope schools, were analyzed separately—see discussion below.) After two years in the program, the students in the private schools were found to have "higher test scores than public school students in language (45.0 versus 40.0 [National Curvilinear Equivalent points]) and science (40.0 versus 36.0)." However, there were no statistically significant differences between the voucher students and the [comparison group of] public-school students in three other subject areas.[85] In short, the study found that students who entered the voucher program in third grade did, after two years in private school, as well as their public-school counterparts in three subject domains and significantly better in two.

Less clear are results from evaluations of the Hope schools, two secular schools that originally participated in the voucher program but in the summer of 1999 closed and opened as two new community schools (charter schools). The Indiana evaluation found that third-grade students attending the Hope schools did not perform as well as those remaining in public school.[86] These results are at odds with the research that my colleagues and I conducted. We found sizeable test-score gains in the first year of the program, gains that were maintained but which did not increase in the program's second year. The findings from the two studies may be reconciled in the following way: 1) the Indiana evaluation looked at the test scores of only the third-graders,

whereas our results are based on all the students with vouchers at the Hope schools. 2) The Indiana evaluation only looked at the third-year students' test score performance only in the second year students of the program, whereas we observed the students in both the first and second years, finding gains in year one but no additional gains in year two.[87]

Taken altogether, the findings seem to suggest that the voucher students in Cleveland did at least as well—and in some subject domains better than—the students in the public schools.

IV.A.2. Findings from evaluations of other voucher programs.

Three separate investigations have examined the impact of vouchers on student learning in Milwaukee. The investigation conducted by my colleagues and I found that students receiving vouchers had, after three and four years in the program, higher scores in both mathematics and reading than students offered vouchers but remaining in public schools.[88] Another study found no differences in the reading or math scores of students in the voucher group and a comparison group of students in public schools.[89] The third investigation found higher scores in mathematics, but not in reading.[90]

The three studies all relied upon the same set of information, so the differing results are dependent on the specific analytic strategy of the investigator. Although it is my opinion that the analytic strategy that my colleagues and I employed (which compares students who have been randomly assigned to test and control groups, the procedure used in careful medical research) is the preferred methodology, one need not dwell on this question but simply

state the scholarly consensus as follows: All studies of the Milwaukee voucher program have concluded that the students in voucher schools performed at least as well as the students remaining in public schools—and two of the three studies found that the students receiving vouchers learned more mathematics than did their public-school counterparts.

A considerable amount of information is missing from the data available on the test scores of students participating in the Milwaukee voucher program, which for the period that data was collected (1991-1994) was limited to a few schools. In New York City more reliable information is available. Over two hundred private schools participated in the program, including many with a religious affiliation; the evaluation of the program was carefully designed as a randomized experiment; and the data collection was more complete than in any other locale. The findings, after the program had been in operation for one year, were as follows: differences between the groups for grades two and three were slight and inconsistent; for grades four and five substantial, positive effects of participation in the voucher program were found in mathematics and, to a lesser extent, in reading.[91] A secondary analysis of this evaluation reached similar conclusions.[92]

IV.B. High School Completion and College Attendance

It is too early to know what impact vouchers will have on high school completion rates and college attendance. However, information on the effects of attendance at a Catholic high school are contained in a recent University of Chicago analysis of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, conducted by the Department of Education, a survey of over 12,000 young people. Students from all racial and ethnic groups are more likely to go to college if they attended a Catholic school, but the effects are the greatest for urban

minorities. The probability of graduating from college rises from 11 to 27 percent, if such a student attends a Catholic high school.[93]

The University of Chicago study confirms results from two other analyses that show positive effects for low-income and minority students of attendance at Catholic schools on high school completion and college enrollment.[94] Even Professor John Witte, a voucher critic, agrees that studies of private schools "indicate[s] a substantial private school advantage in terms of completing high school and enrolling in college, both very important events in predicting future income and well-being. Moreover, ... the effects were most pronounced for students with achievement test scores in the bottom half of the distribution."[95]

IV.C. School Discipline

School discipline seems to be more effective in the private schools voucher students attend than the inner-city public schools their peers are attending. Parents and students who have received vouchers report less fighting, cheating, property destruction and other forms of disruption than do the parents and students who are in public schools.

IV.C.1. Cleveland Findings.

When Cleveland parents were asked about disruptions, the parents who were using vouchers reported fewer discipline problems than a random sample of low-income of parents with children in Cleveland's public schools. Specifically, the voucher parents reported significantly less vandalism, absenteeism, and fighting at school than did a cross-section of Cleveland's public-school parents.[96]

IV.C.2. Findings from evaluations of other voucher programs.

Reports from parents participating in the voucher program in New York City were similar.[97] Sixty-eight percent of parents report that fighting is a serious problem in New York's public schools, compared to only 39 percent of parents with children in private schools. Significant differences of a similar nature were observed with respect to destruction of property, cheating and tardiness.[98]

Reports from parents in the Edgewood school district in San Antonio were much the same.[99] Over half the parents in the public schools of Edgewood reported fighting as a very serious problem, as compared to about a fourth of the parents of students receiving vouchers. A significantly higher percentage of public-school parents reported that guns or other dangerous weapons were a very serious problem.[100]

In Washington, D.C. students in grades five through eight were asked whether or not they felt safe at school. Twenty percent of the public-school students said they did not feel safe, as compared to 5 percent of the private-school students.[101]

IV.C.3. National Data.

Nationwide information on public and private schools yields similar information. A survey undertaken by Educational Testing Service found that eighth-grade students encounter more such problems in public than in private schools. Fourteen percent of public-school students, but only 2 to 3 percent of private-school students, say physical conflicts are a serious or moderate problem. Four percent of public-school students report racial or cultural conflicts are a serious or moderate problem and 5 per cent say drug use is,

while less than one percent of private school students indicate they are. Nine percent of public-school students say they feel unsafe in school, but only 4 percent of private-school students give the same response.[102]

IV.D. Homework

Parents of students in voucher programs report that their child has more homework than do the parents of students in public schools. This finding was consistent across a range of studies.

IV.D.1. Cleveland results.

In Cleveland, parents of students in the voucher program were significantly less likely than a cross-section of Cleveland public-school parents to report that "teachers do not assign enough homework."[103]

III.D.II. Results from evaluations of other voucher programs.

In New York City, 55 percent of the parents with students in private schools reported that their child had more than one hour of homework per day, while only 34 percent of a comparable group of students remaining in public schools reported this much homework.[104] Similarly, in the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, half of the parents of students receiving vouchers reported more than one hour of homework, while only 16 percent of parents of students in public schools reported that their child had this much homework.[105]

IV.E. Parental-School Communications

Parents of students in voucher programs report more extensive communications with their school than do parents with children in public schools.

IV.E.1. Cleveland results.

In Cleveland, our research team found that parents with students in the voucher program attend more school events each semester than public-school parents. They are also more likely to discuss school affairs with other school parents.[106] Similarly, the Indiana evaluation team reported that "parents of scholarship students reported participating in significantly more activities than did parents of public school students." Results from a teacher survey, the Indiana team say, "support this finding."[107]

IV.E.2. Results from evaluations of other voucher programs.

In other cities, parents of students with vouchers also report higher levels of involvement with their school than do parents of public-school students. In New York City, parents of students in private schools reported that they were more likely to receive grade information from the school, participate in instruction, attend parent nights, and attend regular parent-teacher conferences.[108] In the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, parents of students with vouchers were more likely to report that they had attended a school activity at least once in the past month than were parents of students in public schools. They were also more likely to report that they had attended a parent-teacher conference.[109]

IV.F. Suspensions, Expulsions, Absenteeism and School Changes

Most educators think that, all things being equal, it is better that students stay in the same school, especially during a given school year; students usually learn more when not subjected to the disruption that comes from changing schools. Of course, parents should be allowed to move their child from one school to another, if family circumstances require or if a school is not suitable. But forced changes in the middle of an elementary education—either by government fiat or by an individual school—should not be undertaken, unless the reasons for doing so are compelling.

In this regard, some have expressed concern about vouchers and other school-choice programs. Professor John Witte of the University of Wisconsin has argued that "attrition" from the Milwaukee voucher program was its "most troubling aspect."[110] But this suggestion has not gone undisputed. Analyst Daniel McGroarty, for example, has argued that mobility rates among participants in Milwaukee's school choice program were lower than the mobility rates among the city's public school students.[111]

Despite this controversy, the empirical information is unequivocal. Students in the Cleveland voucher program and other voucher programs are not moving from one school to another any more frequently than are students in public schools. Also, suspension and mobility rates are essentially the same for students with vouchers and for students in public schools.

IV.F.1. Cleveland findings.

In Cleveland, the expulsion rate reported by parents with vouchers was well under one per cent (0.2 percent) in both the 1996-96 and 1997-98 school year.[112]

Although reported expulsion rates from private schools were very low, it is still possible that private schools in other ways discouraged low-income families from continuing in their school. To see whether this was occurring, the evaluation asked parents if the child had attended the same school throughout the entire school year. No differences were reported by Cleveland parents of students with vouchers and parents of the comparison group of students continuing in public school. Nor did public-school and voucher-school parents in Cleveland differ significantly in their estimate of the likelihood that their child would be returning to the same school the next year.[113]

To find out whether students from low-income families were being discouraged from returning by private-school officials, parents who had decided to change schools were asked to give their reasons. The reasons for not planning to return to the school were as follows in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned: the quality of the school; graduating to another school, moving from the area, prefer a different private school, cost, and transportation difficulties. Less than one half of one percent said their child had been refused readmission.[114]

IV.F.2. Findings from evaluations of other voucher programs.

These findings are not peculiar to Cleveland. In the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, voucher parents were no more likely to report their child had been suspended

than were public-school parents. And the parents of students in the voucher program were more likely than public-school parents to say their child had remained in the same school all year long. Plans for attending the school during the coming year were similar for the two groups of families. Less than one percent of parents of students with vouchers reported that their child had been asked not to return.[115]

The story in New York City is basically the same. Suspension rates for public-school and voucher students did not differ significantly. Neither did the percentage of parents reporting their child had remained in the same school throughout the school year. The most important reason given by parents of students using vouchers for not remaining in the same school was that the school was too expensive, a reason given by 2 percent of the parents. The percentage planning to place their child in the same school next year was also essentially the same for the two groups of parents.[116]

IV.G. Parental Satisfaction with Public and Voucher Schools

Many economists think that consumer satisfaction is the best measure of school quality, just as it is the best measure of any product. According to this criterion, vouchers are a clear success. All evaluations of vouchers have found higher levels of parental satisfaction among parents receiving vouchers than among comparison groups of parents with students in public schools.

IV.G.1. Cleveland results.

After the first year of the voucher program had been completed, my colleagues and I asked parents how satisfied they were with the school their child had attended. We found much higher levels of satisfaction among parents using

vouchers in the program's first year than among parents who did not use them—even though they had applied for program participation. For example, 63 percent of the parents with vouchers said they were very satisfied with the academic quality of the school, as compared to 29 percent of those who had not used them. Similar differences in satisfaction levels were observed for school safety, school discipline, parental involvement, class size and parental involvement.[117]

Some interpreted these findings as showing only that those who had applied for but not received a voucher were particularly unhappy with their public school, not that private-school families were particularly satisfied. Those not receiving the voucher of scholarship might simply be called a bunch of "sour grapes" uncharacteristic of public school parents in general.

To ascertain whether the "sour grape" hypothesis was correct, my colleagues and I, at the end of the second year of the voucher program, surveyed parents once again but this time compared the satisfaction levels of voucher parents with the satisfaction levels of a random sample of all of Cleveland's low-income, public-school parents. We found little support for the "sour grape" hypothesis. Once again, we found significantly higher levels of parental satisfaction with the academic program, school safety, school discipline and other characteristics of the school their child was attending, if the child had a voucher.[118] The Indiana University study also found higher levels of parental satisfaction among parents of voucher recipients than among all public-school parents as well as those who applied for but did not use a voucher. According to this study, satisfaction levels were higher in several domains: the teacher, academics, order, social, classmates, and other children.[119]

IV.G.2. Results from evaluations of other voucher programs.

The findings from Cleveland parallel those obtained in other cities. In Milwaukee, the evaluation team found that "in all three years, choice parents were more satisfied with choice schools than they had been with their prior public schools and more satisfied than [Milwaukee public school] parents with their schools.... Attitudes were more positive on every item, with "discipline in the school" showing the greatest increase in satisfaction."[120] Studies of the Indianapolis program and an early voucher program in San Antonio (predating the one in the Edgewood school district) also found higher levels of parental satisfaction, when families with vouchers were compared to families with students in public schools.[121] A comparison of similar groups of students from low-income families attending public and private schools in Washington, D.C. and Dayton, Ohio also found much higher levels of parental satisfaction with the private schools.[122]

Similarly, my colleagues and I found large differences in satisfaction levels of voucher recipients in New York City and parents of students remaining in public schools.[123] Much the same results were obtained from the survey of parents in the Edgewood school district in San Antonio. For example, 62 percent of the parents of students with vouchers said they were very satisfied with the academic quality of their school, as compared to 35 percent of the public-school parents. Significant differences in the level of parental satisfaction were also observed in many other aspects of the school, including school discipline, school safety, teaching, and the teaching of moral values.[124]

Religious Identification and School Experiences

The role of religious identification and affiliation has been mentioned in passing throughout this affidavit. Given the interest in ascertaining whether or not religious motivations are the dominant factor in shaping parental choices and school experiences, a variety of information relevant to this question are brought together in this section of the affidavit, whether or not the information has been presented above.

V.A. Religious affiliation

Families newly attending private schools under the voucher program in Cleveland came from a wide range of religious backgrounds. Forty percent were Baptist, 14 percent were other Protestants of various denominational affiliation, 25 percent were Catholic, 13 percent were affiliated with another religion, and 8 percent said they had no religious affiliation.[125]

This same broad range of religious affiliations were also reported by parents applying for vouchers in two other cities. In Washington, D.C., for example, 39 percent of the mothers had a Baptist affiliation, 15 percent had another Protestant affiliation, 30 percent had a Catholic affiliation, 9 percent were affiliated with another religious group, and 4 percent said they had no religious affiliation.[126] In Dayton, Ohio, 43 percent of the mothers of applicants for scholarships were affiliated with the Baptist church, 20 percent were affiliated with other Protestant groups, 13 percent were Catholic, 13 percent had affiliations with other religious groups, and 13 percent said they had no religious affiliation.[127]

V.B. Selecting a school

Parents have a wide range of reasons for selecting a school. The predominant reasons are to obtain a quality educational experience and a safe learning environment. Religious motivations are secondary. When parents in Cleveland were asked the reasons they applied for a scholarship, academic quality was the response most frequently listed as very important, with greater safety and location mentioned second and third. Religion only ranked fourth.[128] When parents in New York City were asked what were the considerations that were very important in their choice of a school, religious instruction was the seventh most frequently mentioned consideration. Such educational and safety considerations as what is taught in class, teacher quality, safety, school discipline, academic quality and class size were all mentioned more frequently.[129] When parents were asked what was the single most important reason for selecting a school, one of three educational reasons—academic quality, what is taught in class, and teacher quality—was mentioned by nearly 60 percent of the parents, while religious considerations were mentioned by 15 percent.[130] As mentioned previously, the Indiana team also asked parents the importance of five factors relevant to their choice of school: reputation of the school, availability of space, location, recommendations of other people, and religion. Of the five factors, "religion was the least important reason for their private school selection."[131]

V.C. Satisfaction with school

Many students attended schools whose religious affiliation differed from their own. However, no evaluation has yet found that the religious affiliation of the family systematically affects the parent's satisfaction with the school. In Cleveland, for example, an analysis was

performed that enabled the evaluation team to ascertain whether or not parents were more satisfied with a school, if the family's and the school's religious affiliation was the same. We found no relationship between these two factors.[132] This finding is based on data that includes families with no religious affiliation, suggesting that children of many different religious backgrounds can have positive educational experiences, regardless of whether they attend compatible secular or parochial schools.

V.D. Religious involvement

In New York City, students who use a voucher to attend private schools are more likely than those who remain in public schools to attend religious services and participate in religious groups.[133]

Impact of Voucher Programs on Civil Society

A major concern of critics of school vouchers involves its potential impact on civil society. Even if students learn to read, write and calculate more by means of a voucher program, these gains will be more than offset, it is argued, by the polarization and balkanization of our society that necessarily accompany greater parental choice in education. In the words of commentator Michael Kelley, "public money is shared money, and it is to be used for the furtherance of shared values, in the interests of *e pluribus unum*. Charter schools and their like ... take from the *pluribus* to destroy the *unum*."[134] Amy Gutmann, the Princeton political theorist, makes much the same argument, if in less colorful prose: "Public, not private, schooling is ... the primary means by which citizens can morally educate future citizens."[135]

Some information about the impact of vouchers on civil society is now available. In this section we provide information about the effect of vouchers and private-school attendance on racial and ethnic integration, racial and ethnic conflict, political participation, civic participation, and political tolerance.

VI.A. Race and Ethnic Relationships

Vouchers have a generally positive effect on race and ethnic relationships. Ethnic utilization of vouchers varies modestly from one context to another; often, African Americans are more likely to seek and use vouchers than are other ethnic groups. Those who use their vouchers find themselves in schools with a more integrated and positive racial climate.

VI.A.1. Voucher utilization by ethnic groups.

Ethnic group utilization of the vouchers varied somewhat from city to city. In Cleveland, those using the voucher were somewhat more likely to be African American than public-school students in general. They were somewhat less likely be white.[136] A similar pattern emerged in New York City. Here, African Americans were more likely to make use of a voucher offered to them, while whites were less likely to use the voucher.[137] In the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, a predominantly Latino Community, the ethnicity of voucher users and non-users was essentially the same.

VI.A.2. Racial and ethnic integration.

Private schools are more likely than public schools—or at least no less likely—to be racially and ethnically integrated, perhaps because private schools can draw students

from a more extensive catchment area, and religious schools may provide a common tie that cuts across racial lines.

Nationally, private school classrooms are estimated to be 7 percentage points more integrated than public schools.[138] Consistent with the national picture, voucher recipients in New York City moved from a less racially integrated to a more racially integrated setting when they left public schools for private ones.[139] However, no differences between public and private school were observed in the Edgewood school district.[140]

In Edgewood we asked students with whom they ate lunch, because inter-racial conversations at lunch time suggests that students enjoy eating together a particularly meaningful finding. Students with vouchers were just as likely as public school students to say that they ate lunch with people of other ethnic backgrounds. Another study of public and private schools in San Antonio that directly observed students at lunch found that students in private schools were in fact more likely to sit with someone of another racial group at lunch time than students attending public schools.[141]

VI.A.3. Racial conflict in school.

Students in private schools are often less likely to be engaged in or witness racial conflicts. Nationally, more interracial friendships are reported by students in private schools than in public schools. Students also report less interracial fighting in private schools than public ones, as also do administrators and teachers.[142] Consistent with these national findings, parents of students with vouchers in Cleveland reported less racial conflict than students in public schools.[143] Similar differences between public and private schools were reported by parents in New York City,

Washington, D.C. and Dayton, Ohio.[144] However, in the Edgewood school district students in public and private schools were equally likely to report racial conflict at their school.[145]

VI.B. Civic Participation and Political Tolerance

Private-school students are also more community-spirited than those enrolled in public schools. Nationwide, students at private schools are more likely to think that it is important to help others and volunteer for community causes. They also are more likely than public school students to report that they, in fact, did volunteer in the past two years. Finally, private school students were more likely to say their school expected them to volunteer.[146]

Public-school administrators themselves (in a confidential survey) are less likely to say their school does an outstanding job of promoting citizenship than private-school administrators do. Similar differences appear when administrators are asked to rate their school's performance in teaching values and morals or promoting awareness of contemporary and social issues.[147] Students educated in private schools are also more likely to be tolerant of unpopular groups.[148]

Conclusions

Choice in American education is now widespread and has taken many forms—charters, magnet schools, tax-deduction programs, inter-district enrollment programs, private schools, choice by residential selection, and school vouchers. Many of these programs give greater choice to middle and upper income families than to poor families. In this context, school vouchers, as currently designed, provide an egalitarian supplement to existing choice arrangements.

They do so without restricting choices to parents with specific religious affiliation or any religious affiliation at all. Given the widespread public interest in finding better ways of educating disadvantaged families, it is particularly important that pilot voucher programs be continued so as to permit an assessment of the effectiveness of school vouchers as tools for achieving greater equity in American education, especially since early evaluations of their effectiveness have yielded promising results. If vouchers don't work, they will be discarded. If vouchers do work, their adoption will gradually spread. But if their exploration is prematurely ended, the country will be denied a valuable tool that could help it to consider the best ways of improving its educational system.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Paul E. Peterson
PAUL E. PETERSON

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 27th day of October, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

---

[1] On Milwaukee, see Jay P. Greene, Paul E. Peterson, and Jiangtao Du, "School Choice in Milwaukee: A Randomized Experiment," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1998), pp. 335-56; Jay P. Greene, Paul E. Peterson, and Jiangtao Du, "Effectiveness of School Choice: The Milwaukee Experiment," *Education and Urban Society* 31(2) February, 1999, pp. 190-213; on the Cleveland program, see Jay P. Greene, William G. Howell, and Paul E.

Peterson, "An Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship Program, Report of the Program on Education Policy and Governance, Kennedy School of government, Harvard University, September 1997; Jay P. Greene, William G. Howell, and Paul E. Peterson, "Lessons from the Cleveland Scholarship Program," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1998), pp. 357-92; Paul E. Peterson, William G. Howell, and Jay P. Greene, "An Evaluation of the Cleveland Voucher Program After Two Years," Report Number 99-02, Program on Education Policy and Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1999; on the voucher program in New York City, see Paul E. Peterson, David E. Myers, Josh Haimson, and William B. Howell, "Initial Findings from the Evaluation of the New York School Choice Scholarships Program," Program on Education Policy Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, November, 1997; Paul E. Peterson, David Myers, and William G. Howell, "An Evaluation of the New York City School Choice Scholarships Program: The First Year," Report Number 98-12, Program on Education Policy and Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, October 1998; and Paul E. Peterson, David E. Myers, William G. Howell, and Daniel P. Mayer, "The Effects of School Choice in New York City," in Susan B. Mayer and Paul E. Peterson, eds., *Earning and Learning: How Schools Matter* (Brookings, 1999), pp. 317-340; on the Edgewood school district in San Antonio, Texas, see Paul E. Peterson, David Myers, and William G. Howell, "An Evaluation of the Horizon Scholarship Program in the Edgewood Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas: The First Year," Report Number 99-03, Program on Education Policy and Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, September 1999; on the Washington and Dayton programs, see Paul E. Peterson, Jay P. Greene, William G.

Howell, and William McCready, "Initial Findings from an Evaluation of School Choice Programs in Washington, D.C. and Dayton, Ohio," Report Number 98-15, Program on Education Policy and Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, October 1998.

[2] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Findings from 'The Condition of Education 1997: Public and Private Schools: How Do They Differ?'" (Washington, D.C.: 1997). <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97983.htm>

[3] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data and "Fall Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education" Surveys; Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), "Fall Enrollment" Surveys, and Projections of Education Statistics to 2007 (Washington, D.C.: 1997) <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/digest97/d97t002.html>

[4] Lynn Schnaiberg, "More Students Taking Advantage of School Choice, Report Says," *Education Week*, September 22, 1999, p. 6.

[5] Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 1997 National Opinion Poll (Washington D.C.: 1997), Table 7.

[6] Andrew J. Coulson, *Market Education: The Unknown History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1999), Ch. 2.

[7] John Stuart Mill, "On Liberty" in *Educational Vouchers: Concepts and Controversies*, ed. George R. La Noue (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972), pp. 3-4.

[8] Milton Friedman, "The Role of Government in Education," in Robert Solo, ed., *Economics and the Public Interest* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955), p. 127.

[9] David K. Cohen and Eleanor Farrar, "Power to the Parents? The Story of Education Vouchers," *Public Interest* Spring (1977): 72-97.

[10] John Chubb and Terry Moe, *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1990).

[11] Paul E. Peterson, "The New Politics of Choice" in Diane Ravitch and Maris A. Vinovskis, eds., *Learning from the Past* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

[12] Joseph P. Viteritti, *Choosing Equality: School Choice, the Constitution and Civil Society* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), pp. 60-62; Bruce Fuller et al., *School Choice* (Policy Analysis for California Education, University of California, Berkeley and Stanford University, 1999).

[13] H.S. Rosen and D.J. Fullerton, "A Note on Local Tax Rates, Public Benefit Levels, and Property Values," *Journal of Political Economy* 85 (1977): 433-40; G.R. Meadows, "Taxes, Spending, and Property Values: A Comment and Further Results," *Journal of Political Economy* 84 (1976): 869-80; M. Edel and E. Sclar, "Taxes, Spending, and Property Values: Supply Adjustment in a Tiebout-Oates Model," *Journal of Political Economy* 82 (1974): 941-54.

[14] Paul E. Peterson, "Introduction: Technology, Race, and Urban Policy," in Paul E. Peterson, ed., *The New Urban Reality* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1985), pp. 1-29.

[15] National Center for Education Statistics, 1997.

[16] Caroline Minter Hoxby, "The Effects of School Choice on Curriculum and Atmosphere," in Susan B. Mayer and Paul E. Peterson, eds., *Earning and Learning: How Schools Matter* (Brookings, 1999), pp. 281-316; Caroline B. Hoxby, "Does Competition Among Schools Benefits Students and Taxpayers?" *American Economic Review*, forthcoming.; Caroline M. Hoxby "Analyzing School Choice Reforms that Use America's Traditional Forms of Parental Choice," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Brookings, 1998), pp. 133-151.

[17] Gary Orfield, *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1978).

[18] Bruce Fuller et al., *School Choice*, 1999, p. 26.

[19] Lauri Steel and Roger Levine, "Educational Innovation in Multicultural Contexts: The Growth of Magnet Schools in American Education" (Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1996).

[20] Dennis P. Doyle and Marsha Levine, "Magnet Schools: Choice and Quality in Public Education," *Phi Delta Kappa* 66(4)1984: 265-70; Rolf K. Blank, Roger E. Levine, and Lauri Steel, "After 15 Years: Magnet Schools in Urban Education," In Bruce Fuller, Richard Elmore and Gary Orfield, eds., *Who Chooses? Who Loses? Culture, Institutions and the Unequal Effects of School Choice*, (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), pp. 154-72.

[21] *Reed v. Rhodes*, 934 F.Supp. 1533, 1575 (N.D. Ohio 1996).

[22] R. Kenneth Godwin, Frank R. Kemerer, and Valerie J. Martinez, "Comparing Public Choice and Private Voucher Programs in San Antonio, in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C.

Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Brookings, 1998), pp. 275-306; Corrie M. Yu and William L. Talor, "Difficult Choices: Do Magnet Schools Serve Children in Need?" Washington, D.C.: The Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, 1997.

[23] California Department of Education, as cited in Fuller et al., 1999, pp. 30, 38-39; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *School Choice: A Special Report* (Princeton, N.J.: 1992).

[24] Adam Gamoran, "Student Achievement in Public Magnet, Public Comprehensive, and Private City High Schools," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 18 (1996): 1-18; Robert L. Crain, Amy Heebner and Yiu-Pong Si, "The Effectiveness of New York City's Career Magnet Schools: An Evaluation of Ninth-Grade Performance Using an Experimental Design," (Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992).

[25] Viteritti, 1999, pp. 62-63.

[26] Fuller et al., *School Choice*, 1999, p. 33.

[27] David J. Armor and Brett M. Peiser, "Inter-district Choice in Massachusetts," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Brookings, 1998), pp. 157-86; David J. Armor and Brett M. Peiser, *Competition in Education: A Case Study in Inter-district Choice* (Boston: Pioneer Institute, 1997).

[28] Armor and Peiser, 1998.

[29] Bryan C. Hassel, *The Charter School Challenge* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1999), p. 1.

[30] "Operating Charter Schools, Fall 1999-2000," Memorandum prepared by the Fordham Foundation, Washington, D.C., October, 1999.

[31] Robert Maranto, Scott Milliman, Frederick Hess, and April Gresham, "Real World School Choice: Arizona Charter Schools," in Robert Maranto, Scott Milliman, Frederick Hess, and April Gresham, eds., *School Choice in the Real World: Lessons from Arizona Charter Schools* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999), p. 7.

[32] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, *A Study of Charter Schools: First-Year Report* (Washington, D.C.: 1997); Gregg Vanourek, Bruno V. Mann, Chester E. Finn, Jr., and Louann A. Bierlein, "Charter Schools as Seen by Students, Teachers, and Parents," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1998), pp. 187-212.

[33] Caroline Minter Hoxby, "The Effects of Charter Schools on Teachers," Department of Economics, Harvard University, September, 1999.

[34] Minnesota Department of Children, Families, and Learning, "Take Credit for Learning," 1997. <http://www.children.state.mn.us/tax/credits.html>

[35] John Haugen, Legal Services Division, Minnesota Department of Revenue, telephone interview, October 21, 1999.

[36] Rob Robinson, Senior Tax Analyst, Arizona Department of Revenue, telephone interview, October 21, 1999.

[37] Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man* (1792), 1:245, as quoted in David Kirkpatrick, *Choice in Schooling: A Case for Tuition Vouchers* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1990), p. 34.

[38] As quoted in Charles L. Glenn, Jr., *The Myth of the Common School* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), pp. 83-84.

[39] *Meyers v. Nebraska*, 401 U.S. 399; *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 528.

[40] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data and "Fall Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education" surveys; Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), Fall Enrollment: Surveys, and Projections of Education Statistics to 2007 (Washington, D.C.: 1997) <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/digest97/d97t002.html>

[41] Coulson, 1999, p. 277.

[42] James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

[43] Major studies finding positive educational benefits from attending private schools include Chubb and Moe, 1990; Derek Neal, "The Effects of Catholic Secondary Schooling on Educational Achievement," (University of Chicago, Harris School of Public Policy and National Bureau for Economic Research, 1996). Critiques of Coleman's findings and other studies have been prepared by Arthur S. Goldberger and Glen G. Cain, "The Causal Analysis of Cognitive Outcomes in the Coleman Hoffer, and Kilgore Report," *Sociology of Education*, 55 (April-July 1982): 103-22; Douglas J. Wilms, "Catholic School Effects on Academic

Achievement: New Evidence from the High School and Beyond Follow-up Study," *Sociology of Education*, 58 (1985): 98-114.

[44] John F. Witte, "School Choice and Student Performance," in Helen F. Ladd, ed., *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1996), p. 167.

[45] Caroline Minter Hoxby, "The Effects of Private School Vouchers on Schools and Students," in Helen F. Ladd, ed., *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education* (Brookings, 1996), pp. 177-208; Caroline Minter Hoxby, "Do Private Schools Provide Competition for Public Schools?" Working Paper 4978, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1994.

[46] Christopher J. Klicka and Gregg Harris, *The Right Choice* (Gresham, OR: Noble Publishing Associates, 1992), 356-57, as cited in Coulson, 1999, pp. 120-21.

[47] Patricia Lines, *Home Schools: Estimating Numbers and Growth.* U.S. Department of Education Technical Paper, 1998; Current Population Reports. Population Characteristics: School Enrollment—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1995. Paul Hill, University of Washington, has provided me with this information.

[48] The study is based on a group of families who agreed to participate, making it difficult to generalize to all home-schooled students. Lawrence M. Rudner, "Scholastic Achievement and Demographic Characteristics of Home School Students in 1998", *Education Policy Analysis Archives* Vol. 7, No. 13, April, 1999. For a commentary on this article, see Kariane Mari Welner and Kevin G. Welner,

"Contextualizing Home-schooling Data: A Response to Rudner," *Education Policy Analysis Archives* Vol. 7, No. 13, April, 1999.

[49] Jessica L. Sandham, "Calif. Rules Hitting Home for Charter Schools," *Education Week*, September 8, 1999.

[50] Paul E. Peterson and Jay P. Greene, "Vouchers and Central-City Schools" in Christopher H. Foreman, Jr., ed., *The African American Predicament* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1999), p. 85.

[51] Florida Begins Voucher Plan for Education," *New York Times*, August 17, 1999, p. A15.

[52] J. David Greenstone and Paul E. Peterson, *Race and Authority in Urban Politics: Community Participation and the War on Poverty* (New York: Russell Sage, 1973).

[53] Paul E. Peterson, *Making the Grade* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1983), Ch. 4-5.

[54] This table is taken from Peterson, "Vouchers and Central City-Schools," 1999, p. 85.

[55] Jeff Archer, "Two Cleveland Schools Plan Rebirth With Charter Status," *Education Week*, July 14, 1999.

[56] Anastasia Cisneros-Lunsford, "Munoz Leaving District, Edgewood Chief Gains New Position," *San Antonio Express-News*, September 10, 1999; Anastasia Cisneros-Lunsford, "Edgewood Oks Uniforms for Youngsters," *San Antonio Express-News*, April 28, 1999.

[57] Jessica L. Sandham, "Schools Hit By Vouchers Fight Back," *Education Week*, September 15, 1999.

[58] Robert Maranto, Scott Milliman, Frederick Hess, and April Gresham, "Lessons from a Contested Frontier," in Robert Maranto, Scott Milliman, Frederick Hess and April Gresham, eds., *School Choice in the Real World: Lessons from Arizona Charter Schools* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999), p. 237.

[59] Susan L. Aud, "Competition in Education: 1999 Update of School Choice in Massachusetts," (Boston: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, September 1999), p. 36.

[60] The results of the first evaluation are reported in Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1999.

[61] The results from the second evaluation are reported in Peterson, Howell, Greene, 1999.

[62] Kim K. Metcalf, William J. Boone, Frances K. Stage, Todd L. Chilton, Patty Muller, and Polly Tait, "A Comparative Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program: Year One: 1996-97," School of Education, Smith Research Center, Indiana University, March 1998; Kim K. Metcalf "Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program, 1996-1999," Indiana Center for Evaluation, Smith Research Center, School of Education, Indiana University, 1999.

[63] This issue quickly came to the forefront of public debates over the voucher program in Edgewood school district in San Antonio, Texas. Shortly after the program was announced, an officer of the Texas Federation of Teachers predicted that the private schools would "cherry pick" desirable students so as to "shorten the honor roll" in public schools. Kelley Shannon, "Texas Kids to get School Vouchers," Associated Press news release, April 22, 1998. EISD school superintendent, Dolores Munoz, speaking on national

television, said that "Right now, I don't have the profile of every child," but she was willing to "guarantee you that at least 80 percent will be the high-achieving students. They will be. The private schools are having the choice of the best students around, because they have a criteria, and not every child is taken into consideration, and their doors are ... not open for every child." (News Hour Online, A News Hour with Jim Lehrer, "School Vouchers," November 27, 1998.) In reply, Horizon scholarship recipients "are not high-achieving students in an academic sense." (Ibid.) Similarly, the superintendent of San Antonio's Catholic schools said that, in order to meet the needs of the new students, his schools have had to add new weekend classes to help some voucher students with reading and math. "We don't bring in the brightest and smartest students," the superintendent said. "We wouldn't have these Saturday programs if that were true." (Laura M. Litvan, "A School Voucher Test Case?" *Investor's Business Daily*, January 21, 1999.)

[64] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, Table 14, pp. 364-65.

[65] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 1, pp. 16-17.

[66] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 2, p. 18.

[67] Metcalf, 1999, pp. 9-10.

[68] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1999, Tables 2, 3, pp. 41-42.

[69] Peterson, Myers and Howell, October 1998, Table 1, p.33.

[70] Peterson, Myers, Haimson, and Howell, November, 1997, Tables 1,2, pp. 7-11.

[71] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1992, p. 13.

[72] Nicholas Lemann, "A False Panacea," *Atlantic Monthly* (January, 1991), p. 104, as quoted in Abigail Thernstrom, *School Choice in Massachusetts* (Boston: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 1991), p. 40.

[73] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1997 Table 1.5, p. 53.

[74] Metcalf, 1999, p. 11.

[75] Metcalf, 1999, p. 11.

[76] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1999, Table 1.5, p. 44.

[77] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1998, Table 2, p. 35.

[78] Dan Murphy, F. Howard Nelson, and Bella Rosenberg, "*The Cleveland Voucher Program: Who Chooses? Who Gets Chosen? Who Pays?* A report by the American Federation of Teachers, 1997, pp. 9-10.

[79] The Voucher Statute regarding registration of private schools for the Scholarship Program also states, at Ohio Revised Code Section 3313.976(A)(4): "The state superintendent shall register any school that meets the following requirement... (4) The school does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or ethnic background."

[80] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, Table 14-5, p. 368.

[81] Metcalf, 1999, p. 11.

[82] Peterson, Myers and Howell, Table 5, p. 38.

[83] A few parents were not eligible because their income was above the eligibility line; however, 90 percent of the students

in Edgewood public schools were economically disadvantaged. Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1999, p. 9.

[84] Parents could list more than one reason for their child not attending a preferred school, so some parents gave more than one of these reasons.

[85] Metcalf, 1999, p. 15.

[86] Metcalf, et al., 1998; Metcalf, 1999, p. 15.

[87] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, 380-87.

[88] Greene, Peterson and Du, 1998.

[89] The initial evaluation of the Milwaukee program was conducted by a Wisconsin research team which has issued the following reports:

John F. Witte, "Achievement Effects of the Milwaukee Voucher Program," Paper presented at the American Economics Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, January, 1997.

John F. Witte, "First Year Report: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program," Department of Political Science and the Robert M. La Follette Institute of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison (November, 1991); John F. Witte, Andrea B. Bailey and Christopher A. Thorn, "Second Year Report: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program," Department of Political Science and the Robert M. La Follette Institute of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison (December, 1992).

John F. Witte, Andrea B. Bailey and Christopher A. Thorn, "Third Year Report: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program,"

Department of Political Science and the Robert M. La Follette Institute of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison (December, 1993); John F. Witte, Christopher A. Thorn, Kim M. Pritchard, and Michele Claibourn, "Fourth Year Report: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program." Department of Political Science and the Robert M. La Follette Institute of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison (December, 1994).

[90] Cecilia Rouse, "Private School Vouchers and Student Achievement: An Evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 113 (1998): 553-602.

[91] Peterson, Myers, Howell and Mayer, 1999, pp. 333-35.

[92] John Barnard, Constantine Frangakis, Jennifer Hill and Donald B. Rubin, "School Choice in New York City: A Bayesian Analysis of an Imperfect Randomized Experiment," Paper prepared for presentation before the annual meetings of the American Association for Public Policy and Management, 1999.

[93] Derek Neal, "The Effects of Catholic Secondary Schooling on Educational Achievement," (Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago and National Bureau for Economic Research, 1996), p. 26.

[94] William N. Evans and Robert M. Schwab, "Who Benefits from Private Education? Evidence from Quantile Regressions," (Department of Economics, University of Maryland, 1993); David Siglio and Joe Stone, "School Choice and Student Performance: Are Private Schools Really Better?" (University of Wisconsin Institute for Research on Poverty, 1977).

[95] John F. Witte, "School Choice and Student Performance," in Helen F. Ladd, ed., *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education*, (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1996), p. 167. Professor Witte's criticisms of voucher programs can be found in Witte, September 1999.

[96] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 6, p. 24, Table 7, p. 25.

[97] The results from the New York City evaluation are of particular interest because the two groups of students and parents being compared are similar. A lottery was used to decide which families would receive the voucher, and these families are compared to families who applied but did not receive the lottery. All results from New York City are based on this comparison.

[98] Peterson, Myers, Howell, and Mayer, 1999, Table 12.1, p. 327.

[99] In Edgewood, those receiving vouchers are compared to a cross-section of public-school comparisons. Findings reported in the affidavit remain statistically significant after adjustments are made for family background characteristics.

[100] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1999, Table 1.9, p. 48.

[101] Peterson, Greene, Howell, and McCready, 1998, Table 9A, p. 53. This finding remains statistically significant after adjustments are made for family background characteristics.

[102] Information in the preceding two paragraphs contained in Paul E. Barton, Richard J. Coley and Harold Wenglinsky, *Order in the Classroom: Violence, Discipline and Student Achievement*, Policy Information Center, Research Division,

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1998, pp. 21, 23, 25, 27, and 29.

[103] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 5, p. 23.

[104] Peterson, Myers, Howell, and Mayer, 1999, Table 12-2, p. 328.

[105] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1999, Table 1.13, p. 52. Similar results were obtained when school effects were estimated controlling for family background characteristics. See Table 2.4, p. 63.

[106] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 8, p. 26.

[107] Metcalf, 1999, pp. 18-19.

[108] Peterson, Myers, Howell and Mayer, 1999, Table 12-3, p. 329.

[109] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, September 1999, Table 1.14, p. 53.

[110] John F. Witte, "Who Benefits from the Milwaukee Choice Program?" in Bruce Fuller, Richard F. Elmore, and Gary Orfield, eds., *Who Chooses? Who Loses? Culture, Institutions and the Unequal Effects of School Choice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), p. 133; see also Carol Ascher, Norm Fruchter, and Robert Berne, *Hard Lessons: Public Schools and Privatization* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996), p. 71.

[111] Daniel McGroarty, "School Choice Slandered," *Public Interest* (Fall 1994), pp. 94-111.

[112] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, Table 14-10, p. 377; Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 10, p. 28.

[113] Data are available for the second year of the program. Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 10, p. 28.

[114] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, Table 14-11, p. 372.

[115] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1999, Tables 1.18, 1.19, pp. 58-59.

[116] Peterson Myers, and Howell, 1998, Tables 16 and 17, pp. 49-50.

[117] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, Table 1.8, p. 56.

[118] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 3c, p. 21.

[119] Metcalf, 1999, p. 19-20.

[120] Witte, "Who Benefits from the Milwaukee Choice Program?" 1996, p. 132.

[121] David J. Weinschrott and Sally B. Kilgore, "Evidence from the Indianapolis Voucher Program," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Brookings, 1998), pp. 307-334; R. Kenneth Godwin, Frank R. Kemerer, and Valerie J. Martinez, "Comparing Public Choice and Private Voucher Programs in San Antonio," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Brookings, 1998), pp. 275-306.

[122] Peterson, Greene, Howell, and McCready, October 1998, Tables 7A, 7B, pp. 49-50.

[123] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1998, Table 15, p. 48.

[124] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1999, Table 1.16, p. 55.

[125] Greene, Howell, and Peterson, 1998, Table 14-3, p. 365.

[126] Peterson, Greene, Howell and McCready, 1998, Table 1A, p. 33.

[127] Peterson, Greene, Howell, and McCready, 1998, Table 1B, p. 37.

[128] Greene, Howell and Peterson, 1998, Table 14-4, p. 367.

[129] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1998, Table 2, p. 35.

[130] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1999, Table 1.5, p. 44.

[131] Metcalf, 1999, p. 11.

[132] Greene, Howell and Peterson, 1998, Table 14.8, p. 373. Evaluations of the other voucher programs have not reported information on this point. I know of no evidence that is inconsistent with the findings from the Cleveland evaluation.

[133] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1998, Table 11, p. 44.

[134] Michael Kelly, "Dangerous Minds," *New Republic*, December 20, 1996.

[135] Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), p. 70.

[136] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 1, pp. 16-17.

[137] Peterson, Myers, Haimson, and Howell, 1997, Table 2, p. 10.

[138] Jay P. Greene, "Civic Values in Public and Private Schools," in Peterson and Hassel, 1998, p. 97.

[139] Peterson, Myers, and Howell, 1998, Table 6, p. 39.

[140] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1999, Table 1.8, p. 47.

[141] Jay P. Greene and Nicole Mellow, "Integration Where it Counts: A Study of Racial Integration in Public and Private School Lunchrooms," Report Number 98-13, Program on Education Policy and Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1998.

[142] Greene, 1998, p. 99.

[143] Peterson, Howell, and Greene, 1999, Table 6, p. 24.

[144] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1998, Table 8, p. 41; Peterson, Greene, Howell, and McCready, Tables 9A, 9B, pp. 53-54.

[145] Peterson, Myers and Howell, 1999, Table 1.8, p. 47.

[146] Greene, 1998, p. 101.

[147] Greene, 1998, pp. 102-03.

[148] Jay Greene, Joseph Giammo, and Nicole Mellow, "The Effect of Private Education on Political Participation, Social Capital, and Tolerance: An Examination of the Latino National Political Survey," Working Paper, Program on Education Policy Governance, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1998.

Appendix Q

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
Plaintiffs,	:	JUDGE SOLOMON
vs.	:	OLIVER, JR.
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:	
Defendant.	:	
SUE GATTON, et al.,	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
Plaintiffs	:	
vs.	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:	
Defendant	:	

AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID L. BRENNAN

In the State of Ohio	:	ss
County of Summit	:	

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, David L. Brennan, says and deposes that he has personal knowledge of the following:

1. Affiant is a lifelong resident of Akron Ohio, an attorney for 40 years, and over the last 25 years has been CEO of numerous manufacturing companies, employing over 5,000 people.

2. The manufacturing companies owned and operated by Affiant since 1975 are in traditional manufacturing industries, such as steel, stampings, plastics, and various fabricated parts. Because of the functional illiteracy and innumeracy of over half of the production employees in these companies, learning centers were established for the purpose of providing basic educational skills to employees. The programs were very successful utilizing computer-based instruction. Affiant attempted to involve the existing public school system using these techniques, to no avail. When scholarship/voucher and community/charter schools became available, this was the first opportunity to pursue education techniques which had been so successful for the company employees.

3. In 1998-99, HOPE Tremont Academy and HOPE Central Academy were two operating private schools, grades K-5. Students were funded under the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program (CSTP). In the spring of 1999, the Ohio Supreme Court had not yet decided about the constitutionality of the CSTP. Our parents were very anxious about the existence of the school for their children in September 1999. After consultation with the parents, it was decided to close the two voucher supported schools as of June 30, 1999, which was done. Two new community schools were formed to take over the premises as of July 1, 1999. Thus, the former students had the option of applying to other

participating scholarship schools, or applying to new community schools to be opened on the same premises. Many parents who previously sent their children to the two scholarship schools decided to enroll their children in the new community schools.

4. In order to attract students to our Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program schools, only those students holding a scholarship were eligible to attend, and we competed with the other 54 schools in the program for these students. In 1996, 350 parents chose to send their children to our two new academies.

5. In order to attract students to our community schools, we engaged in newspaper and radio advertising, flyers, organization meetings, and the like. Further, we had teams of 6-8 people who went out into the neighborhoods surrounding our schools acquainting our neighbors with the availability of the school. All of our schools start with waiting lists for most of the classes.

6. Our community schools are in competition with all other schools in Cleveland. We compete with the Cleveland Municipal School District, traditional and magnet schools, and with other community schools located in Cleveland. A parent dissatisfied with the education offered at one of our community schools can easily choose one of the other available alternatives.

7. This competitive environment forces us to do our best to deliver high quality effective education to our students. Our typical classroom has a teacher, and a part-time or full-time aid, together with 6 computers,

utilizing fully integrated software, with Internet access.

8. I have been involved with the organization of 11 community schools in Ohio. There is a significant demand by parents for an alternative to the local public school system. Educational entrepreneurs like me stand ready to meet this demand. To the extent the current demand exceeds current supply, additional facilities will be built.

9. As the community school program grows, there should be no shortage of community schools, if the State Board of Education continues to approve the applications without additional regulatory requirements. The current level of $4,500 per student is adequate to start a comprehensive and effective school.

10. It has been my experience that the parents who sent their children to the two HOPE scholarship schools, as well as the parents who currently send their children to the community schools, are sophisticated educational consumers. They explore all the options and choose a school based upon what they believe is best for their children. Parents who choose a scholarship school, rather than a community school, make this choice because, from their perspective, that choice is a better option. The same can be said for parents who make the opposite choice.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ David L. Brennan
DAVID L. BRENNAN

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 26 day of October, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

Appendix R

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:
Plaintiffs,	:
vs.	: CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:
	: CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
Defendant.	:
SUE GATTON, et al.,	: JUDGE SOLOMON : OLIVER, JR.
Plaintiffs.	:
vs.	:
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:
Defendant.	:

AFFIDAVIT OF JIM DAUBENMIRE

In the State of Ohio	:	ss
County of Franklin	:	

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, Jim Daubenmire says and deposes that he has personal knowledge of the following:

1. I am Assistant Director, Division of Information and Management for the Ohio Department of Education. I have held this position for 15 years. The Division designs data systems for the collection of data and information from Ohio's school districts. The Division further collects, analyzes the data and information from the Ohio school districts.

2. The Division collects enrollment data from school districts which specify the enrollment for each school. Daubenmire Exhibit 1 is a list providing the enrollment data for particular schools in the Cleveland Municipal School District. At this time this is the most current data available to the Department of Education.

3. The Department of Education also collects enrollment data for chartered nonpublic schools. Daubenmire Exhibit 2 is a list providing the enrollment data for certain chartered nonpublic schools in the Cleveland Metropolitan area for fiscal year 1999. This is the most current data available to the Department of Education.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Jim Daubenmire
JIM DAUBENMIRE

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 29th day of October, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

Cleveland's Magnet Schools (K-8)

School	Grades	Enrollment (Actual Fiscal Year 1999)
Accelerated Learing		
Henry W. Longfellow	K-5	433
Arts		
Newton D. Baker	K-5	605
CompuTech Centers		
Empire	K-5	665
Robert Jamison	K-5	714
Collinwood CompuTech Prog.	6-8	432
Thos. Jefferson CompuTech Prog.	6-8	1,066
Contemporary Academies		
Emile B. deSauze	K-5	466
Margaret A. Ireland	K-5	515
Lincoln	6-8	991
Foreign Language/International Studies		
Kenneth Clement	K-5	308
Robinson G. Jones	K-5	283
Joseph M. Gallagher Program	6-8	1,102
Fundamental Education Centers		
Clara Westropp	K-5	560
J.D. Rockefeller	K-5	478
Charles Mooney Program	6-8	1,157

Montessori		
Dike	K-5	288
H. Barbara Booker	K-5	353
Harry E. Davis	6-8	618
Science		
Orchard	K-5	558
Garrett Morgan	6-8	511
Schools of Tomorrow		
Benjamin Franklin	K-5	723
Joseph F. Landis	K-5	541
Year-Round School		
Douglas MacArthur	K-5	261

Daubenmire Exhibit 1

Total Enrollment 98-99 School Year

School	Enrollment
Archbishop James P. Lyke – Saint Catherine	173
Archbishop James P. Lyke – Saint Henry	257
Archbishop James P. Lyke – Saint Timothy	258
Birchwood E S	77
Blessed Sacrament School	163
Calvary Center Academy E S	110
*Cleveland Community Islamic School	NA
Corpus Christi E S	186
Covenant Kindergarten School	17
*Golden Christian Academy	NA
*Hanna Perkins School	NA
Holy Name Elementary	211
Holy Redeemer	146
Hough Brooks Academy	NEW
Immaculate Conception	193
Lewis Little Folks, Inc.	11

Luther Memorial School	132
Marotta Montessori – Carl B. Stokes	13
Marotta Montessori – Fruitland	20
Marotta Montessori – Glenville	110
Metro Catholic Parish – Saint Boniface	623
Metro Catholic Parish – Saint Stephen	
*Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten – Brackland	NA
*Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten – Superior	NA
Montessori School – Holy Rosary	35
Our Lady of Good Counsel	420
Our Lady of Mount Carmel	236
Our Lady of Peace	209
Ramah Junior Academy	125
Saint Adalbert	366
Saint Agatha – Saint Aloysius	253
Saint Francis	261
Saint Ignatius Elementary	451
Saint Jerome	220
Saint John Cantius	61

Saint John Nepomucene	227
Saint John Nottingham Lutheran	200
Saint Joseph Collinwood E S	220
Saint Leo The Great	525
Saint Mark Catholic	461
Saint Mark Lutheran E S	161
Saint Mary Byzantine	232
Saint Mary Collinwood E S	142
Saint Mel	402
Saint Patrick W. P.	609
Saint Rocco	214
Saint Stanislaus	370
Saint Thomas Aquinas – Saint Phillip	376
Saint Vincent De Paul E S	486
Saint Vitus School	199
Second New Hope Christian	223
Villa Montessori Center	15

West Park Lutheran School – Bethany	189
West Park Lutheran School – Holy Cross	
West Park Lutheran School – Puritas	
Westside Baptist Christian	175

*NA – No data available

Daubenmire Exhibit 2

Appendix S

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
vs.	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:	
Defendant.	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
SUE GATTON, et al.,	:	JUDGE SOLOMON OLIVER, JR.
Plaintiffs.	:	
vs.	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:	
Defendant.	:	

AFFIDAVIT OF STEVEN M. PUCKETT

In the State of Ohio	:	ss
County of Franklin	:	

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, Steven M. Puckett says and deposes that he has personal knowledge of the following:

1. I am Assistant Superintendent for Public Instruction for the Ohio Department of Education. As Assistant Superintendent, I oversee the State's Obligations in the desegregation lawsuits in Dayton, Cleveland and Cincinnati. I also oversee the office of school options, which includes the voucher and community schools programs.

   A true and accurate copy of my Curriculum Vitae which provides more detailed information regarding my professional and educational background is attached hereto as Puckett Exhibit 1.

2. In response to requests for greater choice, flexibility and accountability in education and to reform and revitalize public education in Ohio, legislation was enacted permitting the formation of community schools in Ohio.

3. Community schools are non-sectarian non-profit, non-discriminatory public schools that enroll a minimum of 25 students and provide at least 920 hours of instruction. They cannot charge tuition. A community school is independent of any school district and a part of the state's program of education.

4. Under Ohio law any local school district can convert all or a portion of an existing public school to a community school. A start up community school can be created in any of the eight Lucas County School Districts which were part of the original pilot program, any school district that is in a state of academic emergency or one of the 21 urban school districts.

5. More specifically, in the Cleveland Municipal School District community schools can be created in any of the following ways:

   1. The local school board can convert all or part of an existing public school to a community school.

   2. The local school board can sponsor an unlimited number of start-up community schools.

   3. The State Board of Education can sponsor a start-up community school.

6. Community schools may not choose students. They cannot discriminate in their admission process based on race, sex, religion, handicap conditions or intellectual or athletic ability. Community schools may limit admission to particular grade levels or the number of students they will serve, as well as, identify special areas of concentration. Community schools may also serve groups of students meeting the definition of "at risk." If there are more applicants than available slots, then the community school must use a lottery to fill the slots.

7. Any person or group of individuals planning to establish a community school must submit a proposal to a sponsor such as the local school board of education or the State Board of Education. Initially, the entities must enter into a preliminary agreement which permits the community school organizers to establish a governing authority which consists of individuals who will be directly responsible and accountable for the operation of the school. Each

community school establishes its own governance structure which describes the size, the selection/removal process, and length of term for the individuals serving on the governing authority. Each community school makes its own hiring decisions. Ultimately, the governing authority must negotiate a final contract with the sponsor, such as the State Board of Education.

8. Community schools promote choice. They allow parents, students and teachers to change the type and size of schools and to establish the design scope and focus of the school's curriculum and instruction and to choose the school's location. Community schools do not have the same curriculum requirements as traditional public schools and operate independently of many state requirements. With this opportunity for choice, flexibility and accountability, community schools can become vital resources for education and innovation.

9. In that community schools have the ability to select their own governing authority, hire their own teachers, and make their own curriculum choices, community schools are comparable to chartered nonpublic schools participating in the scholarship program. Community schools differ from these schools, however, in that if the number of applicants exceed the available spaces they must use a lottery, whereas, chartered nonpublic schools participating in the scholarship program are required only to admit their scholarship students on a lottery basis, but are free to select non-scholarship students on criterion of academic selectivity.

10. For the 1998-1999 school year, there were 10 startup community schools sponsored by the State Board of Education and 5 community schools which were part of the Lucas County pilot program.

11. For the year 1999-2000 school year, there are 36 start-up community schools sponsored by the State Board of Education, (one of these schools A Life Skills School will open shortly) 12 community schools which were part of the Lucas County pilot project and 2 converted schools. The law limits the number of startup community schools, which the State Board can sponsor outside the Lucas County pilot project to 75 this year, fiscal year 2000 and 125 in fiscal year 2001. Given the current number of community schools in existence this year, caps will not impact the decision of the State Board to sponsor startup community schools.

12. This school year, there are 10 start-up community schools in the Cleveland Municipal School District. There were three community schools last school year in Cleveland (1998-1999): Old Brooklyn Montessori School, Hope Academy Chapel Side, and Hope Academy Cathedral. The current list of community schools in Cleveland are the following:

	Grade	Projected Enrollment (1999-2000 School Year
Old Brooklyn Montessori	1-4	87
Hope Academy Chapel Side (serves general population)	K-8	315

Hope Academy Cathedral (serves general population)	K-8	375
Citizens Academy	K-2	120
Hope Academy Broadway (serves general population)	K-5	150
Horizon Science Academy (serves general population)	7-9	150
International Preparatory School (school targets students who live below the federal poverty level) (The school is currently looking for a new location and is not presently in operation)	K-12	350
Hope Lincoln Park (serves general population)	K-6	175
Life Skills Center of Cleveland (the goal is to help "at risk students pass the 9th grade proficiency test)	9-12	180
Cleveland Alternative Learning (the school will target students who have had numerous suspensions, behavioral problems and who are a grade level below their peers)	3-5	60

13. It is expected that there will be at least two additional start-up community schools in Cleveland the next school year. Fairhill Intergenerational Community School (K-2) with a projected enrollment of 60 has reached a preliminary agreement with the Department of Education and Academy of Cleveland Community School's (K-6) with a projected enrollment of 60, contract has been approved by the State Board of Education. Also, the State Board of Education has already approved contracts for 16 additional start-up community schools located throughout the State of Ohio to open their doors next year. There are also 2 additional community schools approved for Lucas County, for next year.

14. For fiscal year 2000 (1999-2000) a community school will receive from the State the (base cost) x the adjusted cost of doing business factor. Therefore, a community school in Cleveland will receive $4,052 x 1.1158 = $4,518.79 per pupil. A community school is also eligible for DPIA (Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid) funds, special education money and may participate in programs administered by the Ohio SchoolNet Commission.

15. The Ohio Department of Education remains committed to working with individuals and groups to facilitate the establishment of new community schools throughout the State. The Department of Education believes it is critical to continue to provide educators, students and parents with a variety of program options in order to encourage unique and innovative approaches toward learning through the community school program.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Steven M. Puckett
STEVEN M. PUCKETT

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 29th day of October, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

Appendix T

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.	: CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
Plaintiffs	: JUDGE OLIVER
v.	:
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN	:
Defendant	:

AFFIDAVIT OF LYTLE DAVIS

In the State of Ohio
County of Cuyahoga : ss

Being first duly cautioned and sworn, Lytle Davis, says and deposes that he has personal knowledge of the following:

1. I am the Tutoring Consultant for the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program. I have been in such capacity for three years. My responsibilities as Tutoring Consultant include implementing the tutoring portion of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program.

2. The tutoring portion of the Scholarship Program currently serves children in kindergarten through fifth grade.

3. The maximum number of hours each student may receive tutoring is thirty-six (36) hours per school year.

4. The maximum payment to the tutor for tutoring services is $360 per child. Of that amount, the state will pay a maximum of $324, with the remaining portion being paid by the parent of the tutored student.

5. The total number of tutors available for the 1998-1999 school year was approximately 800. Only tutors approved by the Tutoring Program are eligible to participate in the Program.

6. During the 1998-1999 school year, 1391 students received tutoring assistance and 5145 students requested tutoring assistance. To be eligible for the Tutoring Program a child must be enrolled in the Cleveland Public School System.

7. For the 1998-1999 school year, there were 41 sites where children could receive tutoring. Of those sites, 33 were schools and 8 were other community sites.

8. Over 80% of the families with students participating in the tutoring program have family incomes at or below the poverty level.

9. I anticipate that the number of students to be tutored for the 1999-2000 school year will double from the previous year.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Lytle Davis
LYTLE DAVIS

Sworn to me and subscribed in my presence this 6th day of August, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC

Appendix U

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al., Plaintiffs,	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
vs.	: Judge Oliver
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, Defendant.	:

SUE GATTON, et al. Plaintiffs	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1818
vs.	: Judge Oliver
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al., Defendants.	: (Consolidated Cases)

AFFIDAVIT OF LEIGH-ANNE FORD

In the State of Ohio
County of Cuyahoga: ss

Being first duly cautioned, Leigh-Anne Ford, states upon personal knowledge as follows:

My name is Leigh-Anne Ford. I reside in Cuyahoga County, Ohio. I live at 9104 Beckman Avenue, which is in the Cleveland Municipal School District. I have two

children. Their names are Ashleigh R. Ford who is nine years old and Darrick J. Ceasor, Jr. who is six years old.

During the 1996-1997 school year, my family applied for a scholarship so that Ashleigh could attend Cathedral Christian Academy School as part of the Cleveland Scholarship Program. I've since transferred her to Archbishop James P. Lyke—St. Henry Campus and also during the 1998-1999 school year, my family applied for another scholarship so that Darrick could attend Archbishop James P. Lyke—St. Catherine Campus School as part of the Cleveland Scholarship Program. In addition to applying for scholarships, my family explored the possibility of sending Ashleigh to Empire Computer Tech., a magnet school located in the City of Cleveland and Darrick to HOPE Cathedral Academy, a charter school located in the City of Cleveland.

On September of 1996 we were informed that Ashleigh had received a voucher and on May on 1998 that Darrick had received a voucher. Although we looked at Empire Computer Tech., we decided to accept the scholarship and enroll Ashleigh at Cathedral Christian Academy and Darrick we also decided to accept his scholarship and send him to Archbishop James P. Lyke—St. Catherine School. The reason why we enrolled Ashleigh at this school is because they had better teachers or should I say teacher who were willing to teach, and I felt that she would learn better in a smaller classroom with administrators who took the time with her, and made sure that she would get the education she needs to make it in today's world. Past experience with Cleveland Municipal Schools made the decision easy to accept the scholarship that was offered to my family. As far as the religious aspects that the school has to offer doesn't play a part of why I selected the school. Ashleigh is attending because she transferred from a Christian School to a Catholic School, the education value is

more important than the religious values. My child learns more and comes home to tell me about what she learned in math, reading, science, not religion class. This is the reason why I accept the voucher for Darrick also.

Further affiant sayeth naught.

/s/ Leigh-Anne Ford
Leigh-Anne Ford

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 6th day of October, 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix V

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al., Plaintiffs,	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
vs.	: Judge Oliver
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, Defendant.	:

SUE GATTON, et al. Plaintiffs	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1818
vs.	: Judge Oliver
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al., Defendants.	: (Consolidated Cases)

AFFIDAVIT OF LINDA MASSENGALE

In the State of Ohio
County of Cuyahoga: ss

Being first duly cautioned, Linda Massengale, states upon personal knowledge as follows:

My name is Linda Massengale. I reside in Cuyahoga County, Ohio. I live at 10739 Crestwood Ave, which is in the Cleveland Municipal School District. I have one child.

His name is Samuel Massengale. He is six years old. During the 1997 school year, I applied for a scholarship so that Samuel could attend St. Catherines School as part of the Cleveland Scholarship Program. I have had foster children who went to magnet school such as Whitney Young and Annette Morgan. Annette Morgan, I could not tell by looking at the curriculum that it was a magnet school. All types of children seemed to be allowed here. No certain standard was set. On the other hand; Whitney Young had an entrance exam in which the student had to pass to enter.

In the fall of 1997 I was notified that Samuel had received a voucher. I was happy! I was happy to know that I had a choice for my son's education.

My reason for enrolling Samuel at this school is because the teachers are better, as are the administrators. I am not Catholic, as far as my religious belief, but I do like the boundaries they set such as being kind and loving towards one another. They have a new word for the week. They give out incentive awards for just being a peacemaker. That's just great. I am very pleased with the school and being able to have made that choice.

Further affiant sayeth naught.

/s/ Linda Massengale
Linda Massengale

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 15th day of October, 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix W

AFFIDAVIT OF SENEL TAYLOR

Senel Taylor, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the parent of a ten-year old daughter who has received a scholarship from the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program. I make this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

2. I am a resident of the City of Cleveland, Ohio and live at 3211 East 119th Street. I own and operate a small disco jockeying business. My wife, Jacqueline, is a legal secretary. My wife and I have two children. Our daughter, Kashmir Matthews, is fourteen years old and attends Hamilton Junior High School, a Cleveland public school. Our daughter, Saletta, is ten years old and is in the fourth grade at Second New Hope Christian Academy, a private school.

3. When I heard about the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program, I jumped at the chance to apply for a scholarship for Saletta. She has been in the program for two years. The scholarship has allowed Saletta the opportunity to receive an excellent education.

4. Saletta attended public school for a couple of years. She failed first grade and had to repeat it. Fortunately, it was right around that time that I learned of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program. We applied and thankfully Saletta was accepted.

5. Saletta's progress at Second New Hope Christian Academy has been excellent. Her grades have improved dramatically. She likes Second New Hope much better than her public school, and as a result is excellent in school.

6. We chose to send Saletta to Second New Hope Christian Academy for a number of reasons. First, the level of participation of the teachers at Second New Hope is greater than at the public schools. The teachers are more demanding of the kids than are public school teachers. They do not let them get away with acting up. The classes are quiet and productive. The teachers keep control of the children.

7. Second, the teachers give feedback to parents. When Saletta was failing the first grade in a Cleveland public School, I did not know about it until three-quarters of the way through the school year, and by then it was too late. The public school does not let a parent know when his child is not doing well. There is much more interaction between the teacher and the parents at Second New Hope than at public school.

8. If the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program is not allowed to continue, Saletta will have to go back to public school. My wife and I cannot afford to send her to Second New Hope without the scholarship. This would be devastating for Saletta. She has had so much success at Second New Hope, and I know that this would not continue if she has to return to public school.

/s/ Senel Taylor
Senel Taylor

STATE OF OHIO)
) ss:
COUNTY OF)

Subscribed and sworn to me this 18 day of June, 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix X

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHNNIETTA MCGRADY

Johnnietta McGrady, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the parent of a six-year-old daughter, Trinnietta, and a five-year-old son, Atlas. I am also raising two grandchildren, Reginald Phillips, who is eight years old, and D'Alante Phillips, who is four years old. I make this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

2. My daughter Trinnietta attends St. Thomas Aquinas Elementary School. My son, Atlas, will be attending St. Thomas Aquinas in the fall of 1999. I have received scholarships from the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program for both of my children to attend St. Thomas Aquinas. My grandson, Reginald, attends public school. My other grandson, D'Alante, attends Head Start at Backlend Academy. I do not receive a scholarship for D'Alante to attend Head Start.

3. I am a resident of the City of Cleveland, Ohio. My address is 11217 Primrose. I am a single mother. I work for the City of Cleveland as a school crossing guard and as a lunch aide for the Cleveland Public Schools.

4. When I heard about the voucher program I decided that this would be a once in a lifetime opportunity for my children. Trinnietta has been in the program for two years. The education she is receiving at St. Thomas Aquinas is far better than I ever could have hoped for.

5. I chose to send my children to St. Thomas Aquinas for many reasons: the curriculum, the teachers, and parental participation. Trinnietta started in kindergarten at St. Thomas. At St. Thomas she began to learn how to read in kindergarten. The curriculum at St. Thomas is much more difficult than in the public schools. Trinnietta receives six or seven pages of homework per night. My grandson, Reginald, is in public school and does not receive as much homework. Reginald has a good teacher, but at the private school the work is more advanced. In fact, sometimes Trinnietta, who is 6, helps Reginald, 8, with his homework. I noticed that the further the year progressed the work seemed to get harder and more challenging at St. Thomas Aquinas. I believe the education that Trinnietta is receiving at St. Thomas Aquinas is much better than the education that she would receive at a Cleveland public school.

6. Another important reason that I chose St. Thomas Aquinas was the amount of participation by parents. St. Thomas Aquinas wants and encourages parental involvement much more than they do in the public schools. I volunteer at St. Thomas once a week. Trinnietta's teacher meets with parents on Monday nights to give them teaching tools to use at home. Trinnietta's teacher, Mrs. Demasico, would sit down with me, one on one, to show me different techniques to help Trinnietta with her homework. That doesn't happen in the public schools. At St. Thomas, the teachers are more concerned with the learning process. They sit down with you and talk to you about your child's progress. They are always willing to let you know what is going on with your child. The public school doesn't inform parents on an individual basis.

7. The teachers were also an important reason for choosing St. Thomas Aquinas. My daughter had an excellent teacher, who was very devoted to the kids. The teachers want each child to go over and beyond her limits.

8. If the scholarship program is not allowed to continue, it will be an incredible struggle for me to keep both of my children in private school. I am trying to find full-time employment so that if the program is terminated, I still might be able to keep my children at St. Thomas Aquinas. I do not want my children to attend public school. I feel that they would not receive the level of education that St. Thomas can offer. I only want the best for my children, and I feel that St. Thomas Aquinas Elementary School is the best.

/s/ Johnnietta McGrady
Johnnietta McGrady

STATE OF OHIO)
) ss:
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA)

Subscribed and sworn to me this 22 day of June, 1999.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 8/29/99

Appendix Y

AFFIDAVIT OF AMY HUDOCK

Amy Marie Hudock, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the parent of one child who has received a scholarship from the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program. I make this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

2. I am a resident of Cleveland, Ohio, and live at 8313 Connecticut Avenue. I am a full time lab assistant.

3. I have one child named Amber Lee Angelo, who is eleven years old.

4. My child has been participating in the scholarship program for three years. Before entering the scholarship program, she attended elementary school in the Cleveland Public School system. She currently attends St. John Nepomucene. I want her to continue to participate in the scholarship program, because if she does not, she will be forced to return to public school.

5. I am using the program because I believe that Amber receives a better education at St. John's. Academic standards are higher at St. John's than at public schools. I know of students in public schools who were passed from one grade to another, even though the student did not meet the required academic standard, just because of their age.

6. I also want Amber to continue in the scholarship program because classes are smaller at St. John's. Students can get lost in the public schools, because there are so many students and too few teachers. Because the classes at St. John's are smaller, the teachers are able to spend more time with Amber, and pay personal attention to her. She is able to learn more because of this closer contact. The teachers at St. John's are able to notice each student because there are fewer of them in each class. For example, they call a parent immediately if the student is missing from school.

7. Amber also has more educational opportunities at St. John's. The school offers more academic courses and more extra-curricular opportunities, such as sports.

8. St. John's is also safer than the public school Amber would attend if she were not in the scholarship program. If she did not go to St. John's, she would be bused to a public school in another neighborhood. I don't think that the neighborhood is safe, and I feared for Amber's safety when she went to school there. I was even afraid to drive into the neighborhood of her public school.

9. If the scholarship program is struck down, my daughter will once again be bused to a public school. She will not have the opportunities that she receives at St. John's, and will not receive the quality of education she deserves.

/s/ Amy Hudock
Amy Hudock

STATE OF OHIO)
) ss:
COUNTY OF)

Subscribed and sworn to me this 27th day of July, 1999.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 11-4-2001

Appendix Z

AFFIDAVIT OF SHELIA BOLEK

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

SHELIA BOLEK, first being duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. My name is Shelia Bolek and I am the principal of Our Lady of Peace school and have held that position for nine years. I previously served as a teacher for eleven years at Our Lady of Peace and for twenty-two years at other inner-city schools.

2. Our Lady of Peace is located at 12406 Buckingham Avenue in an economically depressed neighborhood where most of the residents live in rental housing or apartments. If these residents reach a level of economic sufficiency which enables them to purchase a home, they typically move to a more economically affluent neighborhood.

3. Our Lady of Peace school is seventy-five years old and teaches students in grades K-8. Approximately 220 students will be enrolled for the 1999 school year. Approximately 100 of these students will be Pilot Scholarship enrollees.

4. 99% of our children are minority pupils. At least one-half of the families are at or below poverty level.

85% of the pupils are not of the Catholic faith. Our Lady of Peace School is sponsored by the Catholic Church. Approximately 50% of the teachers at our institution are not of the Catholic faith.

5. The Our Lady of Peace School buildings are made available for community use. Mayor White recently conducted a community meeting in our facility. Our gymnasium is used as a voting place and various community groups utilize the school for their meetings.

6. Even though we engage in extensive charitable solicitations to support our mission of helping educate economically disadvantaged children, we each year experience extreme difficulties in financing our operations. We are pleased to help the Scholarship pupils because this is part of our mission; however this presents an added financial burden. When the typical low-income Scholarship pupils arrive at our institution, we find that they are approximately two years behind grade level. Their major deficiencies are in math and reading and we must make appropriate adjustments to insure that these deficiencies are resolved.

7. The parents of the Scholarship pupils have already purchased their uniforms for the 1999 school year, paid their registration fee and a portion of their 10% pro-rata tuition payment.

8. Our standard tuition for regular enrollees is $1,995 per year. Our Lady of Peace teaches all of the secular education courses required by the State of Ohio and its pupils' achievements on standardized secular achievement tests reflect advancement equal to or far above scores achieved at other educational institutions.

9. Our Lady of Peace teaches a religion course, displays religious symbols and provides for religious worship. However, the $1,995 tuition does not cover the costs of the secular education provided to the children. Since the Pilot Scholarship Program calls for grants equal to 90% of regular tuition, the Scholarship Pilot Project children at our institution receive $1,795.50 per year. Needless to say, this does not cover the average cost of the secular education or the added cost incurred in addressing the special needs of Scholarship students.

10. The Scholarship pupils at Our Lady of Peace could receive higher Scholarship amounts if the tuition at our institution was higher. However, since our mission is to educate minority and economically disadvantaged children, any increase in our $1,995 per year tuition would prevent some of the non-Pilot Scholarship children from being able to participate in our program. We cannot charge a higher tuition for Scholarship pupils than the regular tuition-paying pupils.

11. Since the Pilot Scholarship amount does not equal the cost of providing the required secular education for Scholarship children and since large numbers of those children present special needs, many non-public schools in the Cleveland Public School District have refused to register to participate. However, the Pilot Scholarship pupils have done very well in our school and we are pleased to have the opportunity to provide this service and further advance our mission.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Shelia Bolek
Shelia Bolek

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix AA

AFFIDAVIT OF DELORIES JONES

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

DELORIES JONES, first being duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. My name is Delories Jones and I make this Affidavit based upon my personal knowledge.

2. I have the custody and care of my two grandchildren, Devon J. and James T. Jones. Both of my grandchildren have been awarded Scholarships for the 1999 school year. I am single and retired and could not afford to pay tuition.

3. James T. is registered at St. Jerome School to attend the first grade. I have purchased his uniforms and have arranged to make periodic payments to cover the 10% of tuition that is not paid by the Scholarship. James attended Hanna Perkins School last year because he was developmentally delayed. James received special treatment at Hanna Perkins which enabled him to successfully enroll at St. Jerome's. He would not have been able to enroll as a regular student at that school had he not received the special care at Hanna Perkins.

4. My grandson Devon J. is a kindergarten student at Hanna Perkins. He is more severely

developmentally delayed and has difficulty controlling his toilet needs.

5. I am African-American and not a member of the Catholic faith. I selected St. Jerome School because of the educational structure and philosophy which is consistent with that to which he was exposed at Hanna Perkins. Before registering James, I visited St. Jerome School and learned as much as I could about the academic and student behavior programs.

6. If the Scholarship Program ended, I would not be able to afford tuition for my grandchildren. Since both of them have very special needs, they would be lost if I tried to enroll them in the public school.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Delories Jones
Delories Jones

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix BB

AFFIDAVIT OF CYNTHIA L. FELDEN

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

CYNTHIA L. FELDEN, first being duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. The facts set forth in this Affidavit are based upon my personal knowledge.

2. I have been a school teacher for a total of eight years. Five years of my career were spent teaching in public schools in the State of North Carolina.

3. I have been employed by Metro Catholic elementary Schools since December 1997. Metro Catholic is affiliated with the Diocese of Cleveland and is registered to participate in the Cleveland Scholarship Program.

4. During the 1998-1999 school year, I taught math, science, English, reading and spelling to 22 fourth grade students at Metro Catholic.

6. Approximately 30% of the students that attend Metro Catholic are not of the Catholic faith.

7. I am not a member of the Catholic faith.

8. I have never been asked or encouraged by my principal or any of my colleagues to incorporate religion into the curriculum or to otherwise teach Catholic doctrine.

9. I have never been asked to present any materials incorporating Catholic doctrine or beliefs to my students and have never done so.

10. I am encouraged to teach basic morals applicable to all people and religions.

11. During the 1998-1999 school year, I had a student that was a Muslim from Africa. This student did not have any difficulty abiding by all the rules of Metro Catholic while also abiding by Muslim beliefs.

12. I find all people at Metro Catholic to be respectful of each others' religious beliefs.

13. I find all people at Metro Catholic make a concerted effort to work together creating a stable atmosphere united in caring for the whole child.

14. My teaching experience at Metro Catholic has been a great opportunity for me personally. My principal Sr. Ann Malene is supportive of all teachers regardless of their faith background.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Cynthia L. Felden
Cynthia L. Felden

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix CC

AFFIDAVIT OF DAWN CALL

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

DAWN CALL, first being duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. My name is Dawn Call and I make this Affidavit on the basis of my personal knowledge.

2. My daughter Bethann is enrolled to attend Westpark Lutheran School during the 1999 school year as a second grade student. I am disabled and received Social Security income. I could not afford to pay Bethann's tuition at Westpark Lutheran School. Bethann has been awarded a Scholarship during each of the past three school years.

3. I was quite happy when the Pilot Scholarship Program was announced. I attended public school in the Cleveland Public School District and my current disability is related to the unsafe conditions to which I was exposed in the Cleveland Public Schools. I want to ensure that my daughter is not exposed to the same unsafe environment.

4. When Bethann enrolled in Westpark Lutheran School for her kindergarten education, she was developmentally delayed in terms of social and emotional skills. She remained in the kindergarten class for a second year. However, the academic and social adjustment that she

has made in Westpark Lutheran School has been gratifying. Last year she excelled in her class and had all A's with the exception of two grades. She is happy with her school environment and enjoys the educational process.

5. Westpark Lutheran School presents a multi-cultural environment where children of differing racial backgrounds study and socialize well together.

6. I believe that Bethann would suffer a serious set back if the Scholarship Program ended and I had to withdraw her from Westpark Lutheran School. I really don't know how I would ensure Bethann's education if Westpark Lutheran School were no longer available to us.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Dawn Call
Dawn Call

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix DD

AFFIDAVIT OF ANGELA GRANDBERRY

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

ANGELA GRANDBERRY, first being duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. The facts set forth in this Affidavit are based upon my personal knowledge.

2. My son Byron has attended Luther Memorial School since the third grade. He will be in the sixth grade during the 1999-2000 school year. Luther Memorial School is registered to participate in the Cleveland Scholarship Program.

3. Prior to attending Luther Memorial School, Byron attended Marrotta Montessori School for Kindergarten and then attended Dike Montessori School, a part of the Cleveland Public School District for grades one and two.

4. I transferred Byron from Dike Montessori School for the 1996-1997 school year because I was awarded a Scholarship.

5. I qualified for Scholarship because my income falls within the 150%-200% of the poverty level.

6. Another reason for transferring Byron was because of the disturbances within his classroom at Dike. It was difficult for Byron to learn under these circumstances.

7. At Luther Memorial School, Byron is enjoying a multicultural experience. At Dike Montessori, Byron was one African American child among a total classroom of African American children.

8. Byron loves school. He is anxiously awaiting the beginning of the new school year. If the Scholarship Program is stopped, Byron and myself will be extremely disappointed. Without the Scholarship, I cannot afford to send Byron to Luther Memorial School.

9. If the Scholarship Program is ended and I am unable to raise the necessary financial resources, I will likely home-school Byron. Going back to a Cleveland Public School would destroy all of the good things that have been accomplished during the past three years. Not only will his academic progress be stunted, I would fear for the safety of my son.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Angela Grandberry
Angela Grandberry

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix EE

AFFIDAVIT OF THOMAS BARRETT

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

THOMAS BARRETT, being first duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. My name is Thomas Barrett. I serve as the Superintendent of the Hanna Perkins School which is located at 2084 Cornell Road in Cleveland, Ohio. Hanna Perkins has been attending to the needs of emotionally disabled and developmentally delayed children in the Cleveland community since 1951. It provides special child developmental services to children in pre-school and kindergarten and is designed to enable these special need children to enter the first grade as regular students and perform with their peers. Child development specialists meet regularly with the parents during the educational process and prepare them to, in effect, become the therapeutic agent for the child.

2. Hanna Perkins School has been a registered participant in the Scholarship Pilot Project during the past three school years. None of the Scholarship recipients would have been able to become regular students and participate on a par with their peers without receiving the therapeutic and educational assistance available at our institution. We are proud to report that all of the Scholarship students who have enrolled at Hanna Perkins during the past three years have

entered the first grade and participated as regular students after completion of our program.

3. One third of our enrolled children are Scholarship recipients. The nature of our mission dictates small classes and enrollment.

4. There are no other special need educational program equivalent to Hanna Perkins in the Cleveland Public School District and there are only three such institutions in this country. We provide a unique resource for the emotionally disabled or developmentally delayed children.

5. The Hanna Perkins School is a recipient of United Way funds and these funds contribute 11% of the total budget. The children enrolled in the program pay a sliding scale tuition based upon financial capabilities. The full cost of educating a child in our kindergarten program varies between $13,000 and $14,000 per year.

6. Hanna Perkins School is a non-profit 501(C)(3) corporation. It is not sponsored by or in any way related to any religious organization.

7. If the Pilot Scholarship Program were blocked for the 1999 school year, such would impair our efforts to meet the special needs of children in our school.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Thomas Barrett
Thomas Barrett

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix FF

AFFIDAVIT OF IVY T. CHAMBERS

IVY T. CHAMBERS, being first duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. I am a parent of a child who is a recipient of a State Education Scholarship. My son Isaiah is registered to attend the second grade at Our Lady of Peace School.

2. I selected Our Lady of Peace because it has high academic standards and high expectations for its students. It stresses basic morals and family values and provides a broad range of extra-curricular activities.

3. I am a single parent and could not afford the tuition at Our Lady of Peace School if the State Scholarship Program were ended.

4. I am an African-American parent. Although Our Lady of Peace has primarily a minority enrollment, the school advances multi-cultural appreciation and understanding by sponsoring multi-cultural evenings. These programs are held in rooms where the differing cultures are explained and food, clothing and customs are identified and experienced. Members of different cultures are invited to these sessions.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Ivy T. Chambers
Ivy T. Chambers

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix GG

AFFIDAVIT OF CHINA WEAVER-BROWN

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

CHINA WEAVER-BROWN, first being duly cautioned and sworn, hereby states as follows:

1. The facts set forth in this Affidavit are based upon my personal knowledge.

2. My child Chanelle is in second grade and attends Our Lady of Peace School in Cleveland. Our Lady of Peace School is affiliated with the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland and is registered to participate in the Cleveland Scholarship Program.

3. I qualify for Scholarships for my child because my income is at 150%-200% of the poverty level.

4. It is extremely important to me as a parent to be able to send my child to a school that teaches family values and morality. I demand a high quality secular education for my child, but as a matter of conscience want my child to attend a religiously sponsored school which teaches religion and offers worship opportunities.

5. Without the Cleveland Scholarship Program, I would be unable financially to send my child to the school of my choice. Cleveland families that have no religious

preference qualify for a State-financed, secular education for their children at the public school, or at new State-financed, semi-private community schools which are not governed by a public school board. They also are potential recipients of a State paid Scholarship at non-public schools without religious sponsorship. If Plaintiffs prevail, the only parent who would be disqualified for State-finance aid for the secular education of his child would be a family that elected to receive that education at a religiously sponsored school.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ China Weaver-Brown
China Weaver-Brown

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix HH

JOINT AFFIDAVIT OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

STATE OF OHIO :
: ss.
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA :

Joseph Murray, Ph.D., Steven L. Rosenberg, Ph.D., Linda Grimm, Ed. S., Loren McKeon and Carol Weber, being first duly sworn, make the following Affidavit:

1. Affiants, at the request of the Hanna Perkins School, et al. Proposed Intervening Defendants interviewed the Intervenor families for the purpose of determining the psychological and educational impact of the threatened termination of the Ohio Pilot Scholarship Program.

2. The current positions of the five joint Affiants who comprise the examining panel are as follows:

Joseph Murray, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, Department of School Psychology, Kent State University, 31 years of experience.

Steven L. Rosenberg, Ph.D., Director of PSI, Supervising 600 school psychologists, speech pathologists, teachers, health personnel in over 400 schools, School Psychologist, 25 years of experience.

Linda Grimm, Ed.S., Director of Psychological Services, School Psychologist,

previous position: School psychologist, Florida state, 22 years of experience.

Loren McKeon, PSI Director of Prevention Programs (185 schools), previous position: Secondary school teacher, Bedford, Ohio, 19 years of experience.

Carol Weber, PSI Drug Education Coordinator, previous position: Elementary school teacher, East Cleveland, Ohio, 17 years of experience.

3. Our examining panel met with parents and children from the three sample families to determine whether a potential sudden changing of schools in August of 1999 would pose a significant threat to the students' educational, psychological and emotional health.

4. The children of each family possessed multiple characteristics which clearly put them at-risk for developing serious educational and emotional handicaps. We observed the following conditions and were advised by the authorities at Hanna Perkins that these children were rather typical of the scholarship families that have elected to enroll in alternative schools:

- Each child was from a single parent home, either due to divorce or out of wedlock birth.
- Single mothers who were able to work often had two or three jobs to cover household expenses.
- One child is in the custody of the grandmother since the mother has been involved with illicit drugs.

- Each child has educational difficulties which typically lead to placement into a special education program.
- Some of the children had previously been retained in a primary grade for an additional year.
- Each child and family was enduring severe social and economic stresses.

5. The panel judged the sample families based upon fundamental principles accepted in educational and psychological literature. These fundamental principles and the findings of the panel are as follows:

a. Young students in urbanized settings who are at-risk for educational and developmental difficulties require stability and predictability in their educational environment. The foundation for every student's academic career begins during the important formative years, preschool through grade three. Each child's success or failure in school depends upon stability and consistency.

Each family has already suffered changes in their life's circumstances (e.g. divorce, abandonment). These children are now beginning to build bonds and ties with their school, teachers and school based friends. They are part of the culture of their school and are now thriving in their new educational surroundings.

b. Attachment to school is a key indicator of academic success. Students who are well integrated into their school environment become bonded with their school and perform better on measures of intellectual, cognitive and achievement abilities. These students are typically those who succeed educationally and emotionally in school and adulthood.

Each family indicated that the majority of friends and significant adults in their child's lives were at their child's school. Suddenly removing them from their schools without the ability to make other suitable arrangements, would leave them socially adrift; susceptible to new (and very different) social influences.

Additionally, most of the children are receiving a variety of individualized instruction meeting their educational handicapping conditions.

c. Research has shown that bonding with the school and/or community eventually inhibits alcohol, tobacco and other drug use (Hawkins, et al. 1992). The Earlier students become attached (i.e. bonded) to their school, the more probable they are to develop critical "protective factors" which serve to help insulate them from educational and emotional hardships and insults. These "protective factors" help students who are "at-risk" to develop resilient personalities.

It was abundantly clear in each case studied that these students were developing positive and constructive bonds with their school and with their teachers. Their school and teachers represented the primary source of attachment outside their families. Each talked of the "community" feeling at their school which would be abruptly lost if the child were prevented from attending.

d. In general, these children are not resilient to destructive influence and are therefore significantly more prone to engage in negative and destructive behavior patters. (Wonderly, 1991, 1996), (McKeon and Rosenberg 1998), (McNamara, in press), (Rosenberg, McKeon, Dinero, in press), (Rosenberg, Sept. 1999).

e. *The children studied have already experienced some of the most extreme changes in their young lives; changes that most others never have to endure: divorce, abandonment, multiple residential changes, grade retention, etc. Accommodating to their school is an important first step in adjusting to these severe circumstances.*

f. The most effective protective factors contributing to school success are stability, attachment to school and membership in a positive peer group. These three key protective factors include:

- Caring and supportive relationships with adults
- High expectations for the child
- Attachment to the child's educational environment (Bernard, 1991)

Each family emphasized that their children look forward to school in the morning, are becoming progressively better adjusted to their school, to their class and to their teachers. They feel cared for, supported and want to perform academically and behaviorally for their teachers.

6. Each sample family brought before us is surviving extremely difficult circumstances and doing their best to insure the positive academic, emotional and behavior adjustment of their children. In no case was religion or religious values mentioned as a reason for participation in the Scholarship Program. Each sample evaluated family member was completely convinced that participation in this Program benefited the vulnerable children and that a sudden disruption in the alternative education plan would severely damage their

academic, social and interpersonal development. The members of the panel agree with that conclusion.

FURTHER THE MEMBERS OF THE PANEL SAYETH NAUGHT.

/s/ Joseph Murray
Joseph Murray

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of August 1999.

Notary Public

Appendix II

The Racial, Economic, and Religious Context of Parental Choice in Cleveland

Jay P. Greene, Ph.D.
Research Associate,
Harvard Program on Education Policy and Governance
Assistant Professor of Government,
University of Texas at Austin

Prepared for the
Annual Meeting of the Association for Policy Analysis and Management in Washington, D.C.,
November 5, 1999
And for the Buckeye Institute

October 8, 1999

Abstract

Despite the claims of critics, school choice in Cleveland contributes to racial integration by providing families with access to private schools that, on average, are better racially integrated than are the public schools in the Cleveland metropolitan area. Nearly a fifth (19.0%) of recipients of a voucher in Cleveland attend private schools that have a racial composition that resembles the average racial composition of the Cleveland area (defined as having a proportion of minority students in the school that is within 10% of the average proportion of minorities in metropolitan Cleveland). Only 3.3% of public schools students in the

Cleveland metropolitan area are in comparably integrated schools. More than three-fifths (60.7%) of public school students in metropolitan Cleveland attend schools that are almost entirely white or almost entirely minority in their racial composition. Half of the students in the Cleveland Scholarship Program are in comparably segregated schools. This better integration in private schools participating in the choice program is achieved without sacrificing the economic and religious heterogeneity of those schools. Of all the students who attend a publicly-financed school of choice in Cleveland, only 16.5% currently attend a religious school. Yet the evidence on racial integration suggests that access to a choice program that includes religious schools makes a significant contribution to promoting racial integration in Cleveland schools.

Introduction

Some people oppose school choice because they fear that it will foster racial segregation, cultural divisiveness and social fragmentation. As Secretary of Education Richard Riley has stated, public schools, built on the concept of the common school, teach "children important lessons about both the commonality and diversity of American culture. These lessons are conveyed not only through what is taught in the classroom, but by the very experience of attending school with a diverse mix of students."[1]

Private schools are often seen as antithetical to this ideal of the common school, as havens for homogenous groups of students. Expanding access to private schools via vouchers or other forms of publicly sponsored school choice,

---

[1] "What Really Matters in American Education," U.S. Department of Education, published on the Web at http://www.ed.gov/Speeches/09-1997/index.html (September 23, 1997).

critics argue, would only exacerbate the problem of segregation created by private schools. David Berliner, former president of the American Educational Research Association, warned that "voucher programs would allow for splintering along ethnic and racial lines. Our primary concern is that voucher programs could end up resembling the ethnic cleansing now occurring in Kosovo."[2] The Harrisburg, Pennsylvania school superintendent was even more alarmist when he told a television audience that school choice would help create "Hitlerian regimes."[3]

Yet the evidence from the Cleveland Scholarship Program suggests that these critics are mistaken. Rather than contributing to segregation, school choice in Cleveland offers students an opportunity to attend schools that are better racially integrated than what the public schools offer. This improvement in racial integration is achieved without sacrificing religious and economic diversity. Earlier research has also shown that the Cleveland Scholarship Program (CSP) leads to improved academic achievement, expanded opportunities for poor and minority families, and higher levels of reported parental satisfaction and involvement.[4] The CSP is therefore a valuable addition to the range of publicly-funded choices already available to residents of Cleveland. Those publicly-funded choices include a

---

[2] "Experts Differ On Vouchers," *Albuquerque Journal*, May 8, 1999, p. A1.

[3] As quoted in "Pa. Voucher Plan Dies Amid 'Mean-spirited' Attacks," *School Reform News*, vol. 3, no. 8, August 1999, p. 4.

[4] Paul E. Peterson, William G. Howell, and Jay P. Greene, "An Evaluation if the Cleveland Voucher Program after Two Years," Harvard Program on Education Policy and Governance Working Paper 99-02, June, 1999; Kim K. Metcalf, "Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program, 1996-1999," Unpublished Manuscript, Indiana University, 1999.

community (or charter) school program, a magnet school program, as well as the CSP.

The information presented in this paper is a snapshot of the racial, religious, and economic composition of the CSP at the start of the 1999-2000 academic year and could change significantly in subsequent years. The participation of suburban school districts in the CSP, which is permitted by the law but has not yet occurred, could substantially alter the racial economic and religious characteristics of the scholarship program. In addition, the creation and expansion of the community school program in the last two years has significantly reduced the percentage of students attending secular schools in the scholarship program by drawing away the two largest scholarship schools. The Hope schools, which have now been re-established as community schools, educated nearly 15% of all scholarship students in past years. The removal of these secular schools from the scholarship program has also had a profound effect on the racial, economic, and religious composition of the CSP. If the relative attractiveness of the community school program were reduced in future years, it is likely that more secular schools would be drawn to the scholarship as opposed to the community school program.[5] It is important to bear in mind that dramatic changes in the broader set of choice programs that have occurred and are likelier to occur in the future limit our ability to describe the racial, economic, and religious characteristics of the CSP, since it is a program that is in a constant state of flux.

---

[5] The scholarship has a maximum value of $2,250 per pupil. The community school program currently offers schools nearly twice as much money per pupil. Community schools in Cuyahoga County received a minimum of $4,537 from the State of Ohio last year per child in grades 1-8 and $4,195 for full-day kindergartners.

Racial Integration

Public schools are hampered in their ability to offer racially integrated schools because they usually assign students to schools based on where they live. Attaching schooling to housing tends to replicate and reinforce racial segregation in housing. Private schools, however, can and typically do draw students from across political and neighborhood boundaries, allowing them to transcend segregation in housing. Analyses of a national sample of 12th graders collected by the U.S. Department of Education show that private schools students are, in fact, more likely to be in racially mixed classes than are public school students.[6] According to that sample, more than half of all public school 12th graders (55%) are in classes that have more than 90% or fewer than 10% minority students. In private schools, just 41% of students are in similarly segregated classrooms. And private school students are markedly more likely to be in classes that come close to resembling the nation's demographics. More than a third (37%) of private school students are in classes whose racial composition is within 10% of the national average. Just 18% of public school students are in classes that are similarly mixed.

Employing a similar methodology in examining racial integration in Cleveland we see a similar pattern of results. The percentage of white students in each elementary and middle school was obtained for the Cleveland City School District, the suburban Cleveland school districts, and private schools participating in the CSP.[7] Data on the public schools

---

[6] Jay P. Greene, "Civic Values in Public and Private Schools," in *Learning From School Choice* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings), 1998.

[7] Suburban schools were defined as those outside of the Cleveland City School District and in Cuyahoga or Lake counties. High schools were excluded because the CSP does not currently cover those grades.

were obtained from the Ohio Department of Education web site and the Office of Assessment and Information Services.[8] Data on the participating schools were obtained from the CSP office, the Catholic Archdiocese, and from the schools themselves. Complete information was available from private schools that educated 81% of scholarship students.

To assess racial integration we do not want to know who educates a higher percentage of minority students. Schools that had 100% minority students by law in the South had more minorities but were not well integrated. What we want to know is how well distributed students are across schools with different proportions of white and minority students in them. If a system were well integrated it would have virtually all of its students attending schools whose racial composition resembled the racial composition of the broader community in which those schools were located. A poorly integrated or segregated school system would have the vast majority of its students in schools that were almost entirely composed of one racial group.

The racial distributions of students in the city of Cleveland public schools, suburban Cleveland public schools, metropolitan Cleveland public schools (city and suburbs), and private schools participating in the CSP are presented in Figures 1-4 and in Table 1. The pictures tell the story very clearly. As can be seen in Figure 1, the bulk of students in Cleveland City public schools are in buildings that are almost entirely populated with minority students. Almost two-fifths (40.5%) of Cleveland City public school students attend schools that have fewer than 10% white students (which is the same as more than 90% minority

---

[8] http://www.ode.state.oh.us/; "Cleveland City School District Building Profiles," Office of Assessment and Information Services, September, 1996.

students). Another 18.3% of Cleveland City public school students attend schools that have slightly more white students, between 11 and 20% white students. Only 13.4% of Cleveland City public school students attend schools that have more than 50% white students.

In the suburbs we see almost a mirror image of the racial distribution found in the city of Cleveland (Table 1 and Figure 2). More than three-fifths (62.2%) of Cleveland suburban school students attend schools that have more than 90% white students. And when we combine all public schools in the Cleveland metropolitan area (Table 1 and Figure 3), we see that around three-fifths of all public schools students (60.7%) attend schools that either have more than 90% white students or fewer than 10% white students. The vast majority of public school students in the Cleveland metropolitan area attend schools that are almost entirely white or almost entirely minority in their racial composition.

It is also disturbing to note that very few public school students in the city of Cleveland, the suburbs, or the metro area attend schools that resemble the racial composition of the community as a whole. According to the data collected on elementary and middle public schools, 62.5% of all students in grades K-8 are white. Yet only 5.2% of public school students in the metropolitan area attend schools that have a racial composition that is within 10% of the average racial composition. In the city the percentage of students who attend a racially representative school is somewhat higher at 10.2%. But in the suburbs it is even worse, where only 3.3% of students attend schools that have a racial mix that resembles the racial composition of the broader community.

In short, public schools in the Cleveland area are remarkably segregated. Most students attend schools that are almost all white or almost all minority and very few students attend schools that resemble the racial proportion in the whole community. Families wishing to attend a racially integrated school in the public system in Cleveland have very few opportunities to do so.

The picture of racial integration among private schools participating in the choice program is not wonderful, but it is considerably better than what we see in the public schools (Table 1 and Figure 4). Less than two-fifths (35.9%) of choice students attending a private school go to a school that has fewer than 10% whites. And 14.1% of choice students attend schools with more than 90% white students. Half (50.0%) of choice students go to a school that is nearly all white or nearly all minority in its racial composition. This is somewhat better than the 60.7% of public school students who attend similarly segregated schools.

But the most striking difference between the racial integration found in the public and private systems is in the percentage of students who attend schools that resemble the community as a whole. Nearly a fifth (19.0%) of choice students attends private schools that have a racial composition that is within 10% of the average racial composition in the Cleveland area. This is considerably better than the 5.2% of Cleveland metro area public school students, the 10.2% of Cleveland City public school students, or the 3.3% of Cleveland suburban public school students who attend schools that are similarly racially mixed.

If a family wants to live in the Cleveland area and wants to send their children to a racially integrated school at public expense, they are more likely to do so by choosing a private school with a voucher than they are by attending a

public school. Despite court orders and political pressure to improve integration in the public schools, the Cleveland Scholarship Program offers families a better opportunity for a racially integrated school experience.

The Religious and Economic Profile of the Cleveland Scholarship Program

Are the private schools able to offer a higher level of racial integration because they are homogeneous in other respects? It is plausible that private choice schools in Cleveland are able to achieve better racial integration only by being homogenous in terms of the economic and religious characteristics of their students.

This is probably true of the Shaker Heights School District, which is arguably the best racially integrated public school district in the Cleveland metropolitan area. While Shaker Heights is able to offer schools whose racial composition more closely resembles the racial composition in the broader community, students in the district are relatively uniform in having high family incomes. Only 7.9% of Shaker Heights' students receive Aid to Dependent Children, compared to 29.4% for Cuyahoga County and 64.3% for the city of Cleveland. Perhaps the accomplishment of the Shaker Heights District in terms of racial integration is a little less impressive when one considers that it may be permitted only by the lack of economic diversity among its students.

The students at private schools participating in the CSP, however, are not homogenous in terms of their economic status. The average choice student is at a school that has 59.3% of its students with family incomes below the federal poverty level, right in line with the average figure for the city. And as one can see in Figure 5 and Table 2, very

few choice students are at private schools that are entirely populated by families below the poverty line or at schools entirely bereft of poor families.

Unfortunately, comparable data on a school by school basis were not available from the public schools, so it is not possible to compare how well economically integrated the different school systems are. Nevertheless, one can simply look at the distribution of the choice students by the economic status in their schools and see that the achievements in racial integration are not the result of homogeneity along class lines. A clear majority of choice students attend schools with a majority of low-income families, but not all choice students attend schools populated primarily with poor families.

The private schools that choice students attend are also not homogeneous in terms of their religious composition (see Figure 6 and Table 3). The average choice student attends a private school where 54.0% of the students are Catholic. Yet 43.1% of choice students attend schools with fewer than 50% Catholic students. Comparable data on the religious composition of each public school in the Cleveland metropolitan area are also not available, preventing a comparison of the religious diversity in public and private school systems.

While we do not have information on the distribution of students over schools with different economic and religious compositions, we do have information on the average demographic characteristics of CSP students and Cleveland City public school students. For example, we know that choice students, on average, have significantly lower family incomes than do Cleveland City public school students ($15,769 vs. $19,948), are significantly more likely to be raised only by their mother (68.2% vs. 40.0%), and are

significantly more likely to be African-American (68.7% vs. 45.9%).[9] Yet CSP mothers have a statistically significant advantage in the amount of education they received (13.2 vs. 12.5 years) and are more likely to attend religious services. The choice students are significantly less likely to have a learning disability (8.3% vs. 14.8%) but they are also significantly less likely to have been in classes for gifted or talented students (8.4% vs. 15.2%).

In short, an analysis of these average demographic characteristics does not suggest that choice students are a particularly elite group of students. On the contrary, choice students seem in many ways relatively disadvantaged. The advantage that CSP private schools offer in terms of racial integration does not seem to be a function of their having selected advantaged students nor does it seem to be a function of the economic or religious homogeneity of the students at those schools.

How Frequently are Vouchers used to Choose Religious Schools?

While the CSP offers a particular benefit in terms of racial integration, it is important to recognize that it is not the only type of school choice available to residents of the Cleveland metropolitan area. School choice in some form or another has existed for a long time in publicly financed education. For the past two years students have been able to choose community schools, as charter schools are known in Ohio. And for many years before that students have been

---

[9] Paul E. Peterson, William G. Howell, and Jay P. Greene, "An Evaluation if the Cleveland Voucher Program after Two Years," Harvard Program on Education Policy and Governance Working Paper 99-02, June, 1999, pp. 16-18.

able to choose among the magnet schools and programs offered by the Cleveland City school district.[10]

Programs like CSP only modify or regulate the existing choice environment. And the kinds of choices exercised with a voucher have to be viewed in the context of all of the other choices provided (See Table 4 and Chart 1). It is true that most (96.6%) of the 3,765 recipients of a scholarship currently attend a religious schools.[11] Yet one has to view the choices made with vouchers in light of other available choices, which themselves may be altered or abolished over time. If we were to consider community schools as a related part of the general choice environment, then there are a total of 5,852 choosers in Cleveland of whom 3,637 (62.1%) have currently chose a religious school. If we were to add the 16, 184 students enrolled in magnet schools and programs in Cleveland to the pool of total publicly-financed choosers, then only 16.5% of those choosers are currently enrolled in a religious school.[12]

All of these existing choice programs are related. Any change in one kind of choice program could have

---

[10] One could also note the fact that ever since there were school districts and attendance zones families have been able to exercise choice in education by choosing where to live in order to obtain desired schools, as long as they were not prevented by financial or racial barriers to housing.

[11] Some of these enrollment numbers have been estimated based on prior enrollments because this year's official attendance records are not yet available. Modest changes in the exact numbers have little effect on the essence of the argument being presented here.

[12] According to the U.S. Department of Education 39% of students have exercised "residential choice," where access to desired schools influenced where the family lives. (See http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97983.html) If we include the estimated 90,877 students in the Cleveland metropolitan area who may have "chosen" their school via residential choice, then only 3.2% of all publicly-financed choosers are currently enrolled in a religious school.

significant effects on the kinds of choices made in another program. For example, the creation of community schools as a type of choice drew the two largest secular CSP schools, the Hope Academies, from the CSP to the community school program. Prior to that change far more recipients of the scholarships attended secular schools. And in the future the community schools program could be abolished or altered, swelling the roles of the CSP once again with even more students who have selected secular schools.

It is also possible, in fact likely, that new, secular private schools will be established in the future to participate in the Cleveland Scholarship Program, although the extent to which this occurs depends on the relative attractiveness of establishing new community schools or magnet programs. In Milwaukee the number of secular private schools participating in the voucher program more than quadrupled between 1990 and 1999, from 7 to 30. The number of students enrolled in secular private schools in Milwaukee grew more than five-fold during that time, from 337 to approximately 2,100.[13] In short, the types of choices exercised in the CSP depend upon the existence and nature of other choice programs and have to be viewed dynamically over time and in the context of those other programs. When one looks at the broader system of choice in Cleveland, it is clear that a small percentage of publicly-financed choosers attend religious schools.

Conclusion

Whether the CSP exists as one of the choices available in Cleveland may have a significant effect on racial integration in schools. It is clear that not all choices that

---

[13] See http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dfm/sms/histmen.html and http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dfm/sms/mpscfnf.html

people make help promote integration. The most common type of choice, residential choice, has produced Cleveland metropolitan area public schools that are highly segregated along racial and economic lines. Private schools, and perhaps particularly religious private schools, appear able to transcend resistance to integration in housing to provide schools that are racially, economically, and religiously integrated.

It is not entirely clear why families appear to be willing to send their children to integrated private schools when they may be reluctant to send their children to integrated public schools. Perhaps families trust the private schools to provide discipline and safety in an integrated environment more than they trust public schools to do the same. Perhaps families share in the stronger sense of mission offered by private, especially religious schools, reducing the salience of race as a factor in school selection. Whatever the reason for it, the evidence is clear that, contrary to the expectations of critics, school choice helps promote integration.

Appendix JJ

AFFIDAVIT OF CHRISTINE SUMA

Christine Suma, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the parent of three children who have received scholarships from the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program. I make this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

2. I am a resident of Cleveland, Ohio and live at 3211 Natchez Street. I am a full-time homemaker. My husband is a corrections officer. He is a corporal at a local jail.

3. We have twelve children: Bonnie Squires, who is 23; Nathan Suma, who is 22; Grace Suma, who is 20; Carolyn Suma, who is 19; Maria Suma, who is 16; Anthony Suma, who is 14; Ann Suma, who is 12; Dominic Suma, who is 9; Gloria Suma, who is 8; Emeric Suma, who is 7; Emily Suma, who is 5; and Angelica Suma, who is 2.

4. Bonnie is married. Both Bonnie and Nathan graduated from college this past May. Two of our children currently attend Trinity High School. One is a sophomore at Syracuse University, and another is a junior at University of Detroit Mercy. Ann, Dominic, Gloria, Emeric, and Emily all attend Our Lady of Good Counsel, a private K-8 school. Ann was too old to participate in the scholarship program, and Emily is on the waiting list to receive a scholarship. Dominic, Gloria, and Emeric are currently participating in the scholarship program. I plan to have my children continue to participate in the scholarship program.

5. I am using the program because the academic standards at Our Lady of Good Counsel are higher than the standards at the public schools. My older children got on the dean's list in college and the honor roll in high school. I believe this is because they received an excellent education at Our Lady during grade school. I think it is essential to get a good education in grade school to succeed academically in college.

6. At Our Lady, the teachers care about the children. If one of my children does not show up for school, the school immediately notices and calls me within fifteen minutes. In addition to the teachers' genuine caring, I think that this type of attention is also due to Our Lady's small class sizes, which are between 18-25 students. The public schools, however, are very crowded, and it is easy for a child to get lost in the system. At Our Lady, my children are viewed as individuals, not as numbers like at a public school. I also like that the teachers know me. At public schools, the teachers do not have personal relationships with the students' parents like the teachers at private schools have.

7. I also am using the scholarship program to send my children to Our Lady because it is three blocks away from our home. My children's friends are fellow Our Lady classmates who live in our neighborhood. Moreover, my husband and I both attended Our Lady when we were children. I view attending Our Lady as a family tradition, and I believe tradition adds stability to families. I also believe that my children are getting a much better education at Our Lady than at a public school. The school has been educating students for over 100 years, and I believe this is because parents have been pleased with their children's education and hence have decided to keep sending their children there. I also sent my children to Our Lady because I

wanted the faith that we practice to be reinforced while my children are at school.

8. If the scholarship program ended, it would cause my family to have financial troubles. Because ensuring that my children receive a good education in grade school is so important to me, I would be basically forced to go into the workforce instead of being able to take care of my children myself. I am much more needed at home than I am needed in the workforce. My other option would be homeschooling which I would do before sending my children to the inadequate schools in Cleveland's public school system. The scholarship frees up money that would be used normally as a tuition payment. It allows us to be more financially solvent. The scholarship allows us to have a sense of control; it allows us to make hard-earned dollars stretch a lot further and, as parents, have more control of our basic responsibility to make decisions which directly involve the welfare of our children.

/s/ Christine Suma
Christine Suma

STATE OF OHIO)
) ss:
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA)

Subscribed and sworn to me this 22 day of July, 1999.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires Oct. 20, 2002

Appendix KK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al., Plaintiffs,	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
vs.	: Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, Defendant,	
and	
SENEL TAYLOR, et al., Intervenors/Defendants.	

SUE GATTON, et al. Plaintiffs	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1818
vs.	: Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al., Defendants,	: **DECLARATION OF DAVID P. ZANOTTI**
and	
SENEL TAYLOR, et al., Intervenors/Defendants.	

Declarant David P. Zanotti hereby states under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am an adult resident of Strongsville, Ohio, and make this declaration based upon my knowledge of the facts set forth herein.

2. Since 1986, I have been the President of the Ohio Roundtable. The Ohio Roundtable has been intimately involved in the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program since its inception in 1995, as an aspect of our efforts to improve educational quality in Cleveland and throughout Ohio. The Roundtable actively supported the creation of the Scholarship Program in 1995, as well as the subsequent creation of Ohio's community school legislation in 1998. We regard both programs as vital steps in improving educational opportunities for Ohio families by giving parents a wider array of educational options and children more educational opportunity.

3. The Cleveland City School District has experienced severe and systemic problems in recent decades. This has led to the creation of multiple programs designed to expand educational options, particularly magnet schools, community schools, and the scholarship program.

4. The scholarship program and the other choice programs have begun to create a more dynamic environment for education in Cleveland. The creation of the scholarship program led to the creation of several new nonsectarian schools, created to offer new alternatives to the participating children. These schools include Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten, and the two HOPE Academies, HOPE Central Academy and HOPE Ohio City Academy.

5. Shortly after the program was founded, several lawsuits were filed in state court challenging its constitutionality. Although these lawsuits never resulted in suspension of the program, such a suspension was a constant threat hanging over the program's head. The uncertainty engendered by the lawsuits had a chilling effect on the creation of new schools and the expansion of existing schools, since we never knew whether the courts might halt the program. Particularly, by discouraging the creation of new nonreligious schools, which would have run a greater risk than religious schools that have the resources of their sponsoring denominations to fall back on, the ongoing litigation adversely affected the normal development of the program.

6. The two largest nonreligious schools in the program originally were the two HOPE Academies, which together enrolled approximately 15% of all children in the program, including approximately 25% of those students who transferred out of the Cleveland public schools. In June of 1997, Ohio passed a charter school law, establishing "community schools," which are independent public schools. Under the community school legislation, community schools in Cleveland receive $4,500 for every student they enroll. Under the Scholarship Program, the participating schools can receive a maximum of $2,250 per student. Since nonreligious schools have no religious affiliation to give up in order to become community schools, they have little reason not to establish community schools and receive a higher tuition payment. The two HOPE Academies, caught in the uncertainty of continued litigation, did in fact close. Two new HOPE community schools replaced the prior HOPE Academies. This action caused a substantial drop in the number of scholarship students enrolled in non-religious schools.

7. Both community schools and scholarship schools provide parents with taxpayer-funded alternatives to geographically-assigned public schools. As the example of the HOPE Academies demonstrates, there exist significant financial incentives for nonreligious schools to prefer to operate as community schools rather than as scholarship schools. From the perspective of the parents, however, there is little difference if any between a scholarship school and a community school. Each is a school of choice, which a family is free to choose for their child and free to leave if it fails to satisfy them.

8. Community schools now comprise a substantial component of the school choice universe in Cleveland. Including the two new HOPE community schools, there are ten community schools enrolling Cleveland students. All told these ten schools enroll 2,087 students. All of these schools are, of course, nonreligious schools.

9. With the departure of the two HOPE Academies, the nonreligious schools remaining in the scholarship program are all quite small. Two of them serve only kindergarten students: Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten and the Covenant Kindergarten School. Both schools are outgrowths of Head Start programs that began in churches, which is why they have names that appear to be church-related, despite their being nonreligious schools. Each school operates only one kindergarten class. Under the preliminary injunction that prevents the scholarship program from paying out the scholarships on which the parents and schools were counting, the financial viability of these schools is severely compromised, because the overwhelming majority of their students were scholarship students. Both schools are in danger of closing. The irony of this event should it occur would be devastating: this lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the scholarship program

because it includes religious schools will have driven out of the program two of the remaining *nonreligious* schools about whose inclusion the plaintiffs have no basis for objecting.

10. I am confident that once the litigation is concluded and the uncertainty removed from the scholarship program, the number of schools participating in the program, both sectarian and nonsectarian, will grow.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 28th day of October 1999.

/s/ David P. Zanotti
David P. Zanotti

Appendix LL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al., Plaintiffs,	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
vs.	: Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, Defendant,	:
and	:
SENEL TAYLOR, et al., Intervenors/Defendants.	:

SUE GATTON, et al. Plaintiffs	: Case No. 1:99 CV 1818
vs.	: Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al., Defendants,	: **DECLARATION OF DR. HOWARD FULLER**
and	:
SENEL TAYLOR, et al., Intervenors/Defendants.	:

Declarant Dr. Howard Fuller hereby states under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am an adult resident of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and make this affidavit based upon my knowledge of the facts set forth herein.

2. I have a bachelor's degree in sociology from Carroll College in Waukesha, Wisconsin. My minors there were in history and secondary education. I also have a master's degree in social administration from Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio and a Ph.D. in Sociological Foundations of Education from Marquette University.

3. I am currently a Distinguished Professor of Education and the founder and Director of the Institute for the Transformation of Learning at Marquette University. The goal of the Institute is to create new community learning infrastructures that can prepare all children to acquire the knowledge and skills they need for success. I also served for two years as a senior fellow for the Annenburg Institute for School Reform at Brown University.

4. I have been involved in issues of education reform and improvement for over 20 years. When I was in graduate school in Cleveland, Ohio I was a member of the Congress of Racial Equality and was very much involved with the struggles surrounding school integration in Cleveland in the early 1960s. I am particularly interested in issues involving the education of urban minority youth in cities such as Milwaukee and Cleveland.

5. From June of 1991 to June of 1995, I was the superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools. I took that job primarily to ensure that low-income African-American

children could get a quality education. For a significant number of these children, the public education system simply does not work in terms of providing them with an effective education.

6. Shortly before my tenure as superintendent, Wisconsin instituted the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. The program is much like Cleveland's in that it allows low-income families to use a portion of state education funds to remove their children from failing schools and send them to the schools they think will best meet the needs of their children.

7. The Milwaukee and Cleveland pilot scholarship programs currently are the only two school choice programs aimed specifically at providing greater educational opportunities to students in urban school districts. These experimental programs have the potential for teaching us important lessons about improving educational opportunities in similar urban school districts, such as Detroit, Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, New York, New York, Washington, DC, and many others.

8. After I resigned as superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools, I conducted a research project to provide a profile of students and schools eligible for the expanded Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. The expanded program permitted up to 15% of MPS students to attend any private school in the City of Milwaukee, including religious schools. My data showed that the students eligible for the program were concentrated in some of the poorest, most racially segregated areas of the city. It also showed that schools eligible to participate were scattered throughout the city and already served many students not of the same faith. In terms of academic results, the data showed that graduation rates are considerably higher at private schools where 88% of

freshmen graduate compared to about 45% of freshmen who attend MPS high schools. Based on these data and my experience as superintendent, I conclude that the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program offers educational opportunity to some of the most disadvantaged children in Milwaukee.

9. Other research in Milwaukee also points to positive results. Research for the State of Wisconsin and for PAVE, the privately funded scholarship program, shows that parents who exercise choice are more satisfied than public school parents and that they become more involved. For decades, educational research has linked parental involvement to improved academic outcomes. A study conducted by the Program on Education Policy and Governance shows significant gains in math and reading scores, gains that were they to continue could close the gap between minority and white achievement. Research by PAVE indicates school choice substantially reduces student mobility. In Milwaukee, student mobility in the public schools is about 30% (student mobility reflects the number of students who move from one school to another). PAVE's study showed that only about 6 percent of the parents who exercised choice moved their children from one school to another.

10. While the findings in the research noted above are specific to Milwaukee, the conclusions are equally applicable to Cleveland. The public school systems in both cities have been plagued with the same problems. In Milwaukee only 48% of students who entered ninth grade in 1990 managed to graduate on time. From what I understand, the situation in Cleveland is worse. A study conducted by the Cleveland Public Schools demonstrates that only 26% of students who entered ninth grade in 1991 graduated on time and that only 7% of the students could pass the 12th grade proficiency examination upon graduation. Cleveland Public

Schools, "Getting the Job Done: A Blueprint to Improve Student Performance and Achieve Financial Stability" (Nov. 1995).

11. The effects of Cleveland's failing educational system are particularly pronounced in the inner-city minority community. Slightly over 70% of the students in the Cleveland City School District are African-American and more than 7% are Hispanic. Many of the families of these children cannot afford to exercise choice by moving to another district or by sending their children to private schools, so their children remain trapped in an education system that fails to prepare them for the future.

12. Cleveland's Pilot Project Scholarship Program demonstrates a way to rectify this dismal situation by giving low-income families access to the same education opportunities that families with more resources use. A 1999 study conducted by the Program on Education Policy and Governance at Harvard University reveals that 68.7% of scholarship recipients in Cleveland are African-American and 70% come from single-parent homes. Program on Education Policy and Governance, "An Evaluation of the Cleveland Voucher Program After Two Years" (Jun. 1999). As in the case in Milwaukee, few of these children could have attended private schools without the help of the scholarship program.

13. The Harvard study also reveals that students who participated in the Cleveland Scholarship Program achieved substantial gains in mathematics and reading tests. After just two years of attendance in the Hope schools, brand new private schools created for scholarship students, these students, on average, gained seven percentile points relative to the national norm on the reading test and 15 percentile points on the math test. A similar Harvard study conducted

of participants in the Milwaukee Program showed that participants posted only modest, if any, gains after two years in the program, but that those gains accelerated and became increasingly significant by the third and fourth years in the program. Greene, Peterson, and Du, "School Choice in Milwaukee: A Randomized Experiment" in *Learning From School Choice* (Peterson and Hassel, eds.) (Brookings Institution Press, 1998).

14. As noted earlier, parents of scholarship recipients were more satisfied with the private schools to which they sent their children than were the parents of students in public schools. For example, roughly half of these parents reported being "very satisfied" with the academic program and safety of their children's school, as compared to less than 30% of public school parents. Similarly, about half of the scholarship parents were very satisfied with school discipline, versus only a quarter of public school parents. The differences in satisfaction rates were also large when parents were asked about teachers, the teaching of moral values, and student to teacher ratios.

15. The parents of scholarship recipients reported lower levels of disruption in their children's schools. For example, only 12% of these parents felt that fighting between students was a problem at their schools. In contrast, 27% of public school parents expressed concerns about student violence. Racial conflicts seem to be more prevalent at public schools where 10% of parents thought them to be a problem. Only 5% of scholarship parents expressed similar concerns. Similarly, 13% of public school parents reported that vandalism was a problem at their children's schools, as compared to only 3% of scholarship parents.

16. Opponents of school choice programs often claim that although scholarship recipients are benefited by

the programs, the students who remain in the public schools are hurt by a loss of finances. This has not proven to be true in Milwaukee. After the Milwaukee program went into effect, the data indicated that there was no unfair financial impact on the public schools. Per pupil spending increased because students who left public schools took with them less than total per pupil funding. Perhaps it would have been better if there had been an adverse effect. I firmly believe that in a situation where dollars follow students, there would be positive impact on the education system. Such a situation helps to shape a discussion about how to improve the public school system. Furthermore, this would force public schools to improve in order to compete for students – students that these schools could previously take for granted because they could not choose to go elsewhere.

17. The positive reaction of the public and private schools in Milwaukee shows that parental choice helps improve all schools. During the last year, the Milwaukee Public Schools have: 1) sought to encourage parents of young children to attend MPS by promising in radio ads that the district will hire private tutors if students are not able to read at grade level by third grade; 2) permitted a dozen schools to hire teachers outside the seniority system that stymies reform; 3) responded to longstanding requests by parents for more new schools that specialize in such popular programs as Montessori. Private schools are working to revamp their curricula, understanding that parents now have the power to choose. Moreover, last April, Milwaukee voters elected a slate of reform candidates to the MPS board who believe that parents deserve options. All of these actions suggest that all schools – public and private – can no longer take parents for granted.

18. For the entirety of its existence until 1998, the Milwaukee program suffered under a cloud of litigation that

inhibited its growth. Indeed, the 1995 expansion of the program to include religious schools was enjoined until the Supreme Court of Wisconsin declared the expansion constitutional in 1998. Since the litigation cloud was lifted, the growth of the program has been dynamic, in terms of both religious and nonreligious school participation. The program has grown from 6,200 students in the 1998-99 school year, the first year following the court's decision, to about 8,000 students and 99 schools in the 1999-2000 school year. Many schools have waiting lists. Nonsectarian schools have grown from 7 in the initial program to 30 last year.

19. The critical issue is not whether children go to private or public schools, to religious or nonsectarian schools, but whether they go to good or bad schools. More options for parents means that more families have more opportunities to choose schools best for their children. Cleveland's scholarship program increases educational opportunity.

19. Parents in Milwaukee and Cleveland have more options than low-income families that live in other urban areas. This addresses a serious inequity in education in America: the children of most families already exercise choice by choosing to live in a public school district that they believe provides a good education or by sending their children to private schools. Giving low-income parents an educational vote simply allows them to take advantage of educational opportunities that most parents in this country take for granted.

20. In Milwaukee and Cleveland, school choice programs add to an array of options available to urban parents. In Milwaukee, for example, parents may choose specialty – or magnet – schools. Students considered to be at-risk may attend alternative schools, including private

schools under contract to the public school district. Parents may choose charter schools or they may send their children to neighboring districts if such action integrates schools. In many respects, the school choice programs in Milwaukee and Cleveland simply continue efforts to expand options for urban parents whose children attend public districts that fail some children.

21. The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program has seen dynamic growth in the number of nonsectarian schools participating in the program. The increase in the number of nonsectarian schools has been accompanied by a substantial growth in the number of students enrolled in nonsectarian schools: from 337 in 1990-91, to 786 in 1994-95, to 1,320 in 1995-96, to 2,215 in 1998-99, to 3,025 (of a total of 8,066) in this school year.

22. The primary effect of parental choice programs like Milwaukee and Cleveland's is to expand educational choices for low-income families, which is good for the children and for their families, and also good for the educational system by fomenting institutional reform and improvement within the public schools. The inclusion of religious schools and the creation of community schools allow families greater options and give them greater leverage in the educational discussions and marketplace.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 26 day of October 1999.

/s/ Howard Fuller, Ph.D.
Howard Fuller, Ph.D.

Appendix MM

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, *et al.*,	)
	) Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	) Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
v.	)
	)
SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, STATE OF OHIO, *et al.*,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

SUE GATTON, *et al.*,	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	) Case No. 1:99 CV 1818
	)
v.	) Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.
	)
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, *et al.*,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

DECLARATION OF ALICE O'BRIEN

ALICE O'BRIEN declares under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. My name is Alice O'Brien. I am over twenty-one years of age and am competent to make this declaration. I am an attorney with the firm of Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C., counsel for Plaintiffs Simmons-Harris, *et al.*, in this matter and have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein.

2. Attached as Exhibit A is R.C. §§ 3313.974-3313.979, which establishes the Ohio Pilot Project Scholarship Program ("1999 Voucher Program").

3. In order to obtain information about the operation of the 1999 Voucher Program, on September 10, 1999, plaintiffs Doris-Simmons Harris, *et al.*, and Sue Gatton, *et al.*, served the State of Ohio ("State") with discovery requests. True and correct copies of the State's response to that request, and the documents produced therewith, are attached as Exhibits B(1-6) and are as follows:

Exhibit B(1) – State's Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Documents and Information

Exhibit B(2) – List of Schools Participating in the 1999 Voucher Program

Exhibit B(3) – List of Religious Affiliations of Participating Schools

Exhibit B(4) – Total Student Enrollment in Each Participating School as of the 1998-99 School Year

Exhibit B(5) – Number of Voucher Students Enrolled in Each Participating School Who Participated in the 1995 Voucher Program

Exhibit B(6) – Number of Voucher Students Enrolled in Each Participating School Who Did Not Participate in 1995 Voucher Program

4. The plaintiffs also requested information regarding the religious affiliations of schools participating in the 1999 Voucher Program from Intervenors/Defendants Hanna Perkins, *et al.*, ("Hanna Perkins"). On September 23, 1999, plaintiffs received a letter and two lists from the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants providing that information. A true and correct copy of that letter and those lists is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

5. Seeking to clarify certain minor discrepancies in the information provided by the State and the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants, plaintiffs sent letters to both parties and the parties responded to those letters. True and correct copies of that correspondence are attached hereto as Exhibit D.

6. The information provided by the State and the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants about the number and religious affiliation of the schools participating in the 1999 Voucher Program, as well as the number of voucher students enrolled in each school (*i.e.*, the information in Exhibits B-D), is summarized in a chart attached hereto as Exhibit E. As that chart shows, fifty-six schools are participating in the 1999 Voucher Program and, as of September 1999, voucher students were enrolled in fifty-three of those schools. According to the religious affiliation information provided by

the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants and the State, which is confirmed by the materials produced by the schools themselves, *see infra* at Exhibits H-I(1-41), forty-six of the participating schools in which voucher students are enrolled are sectarian, and thirty-five of those sectarian schools are affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church. Of the 3,761 students who are attending a school under the 1999 Voucher Program, 3,632 are enrolled in sectarian schools.

7. Seeking further information about the nature of the schools participating in the 1999 Cleveland Scholarship Program, on September 29, 1999, plaintiffs issued subpoenas duces tecum to those schools asking them to produce, *inter alia*, their mission statements and handbooks. The plaintiffs and the intervenors/defendants have stipulated that the documents produced by the schools in response to those subpoenas "are authentic, speak for themselves ... and are not false or misleading." That stipulation is attached hereto as Exhibit F.

8. The State declined to enter into the stipulation, but by letter dated October 6, 1999, represented that it "is in no position to contest the authenticity of" the materials produced by the schools. A true and correct copy of that letter is attached hereto as Exhibit G.

9. To facilitate the Court's review of the materials referenced in paragraph 7 above, excerpts from those documents are attached as Exhibit H. In addition, true and correct copies of all of the school handbooks and, if not included in the school handbooks, the mission statements, produced by the sectarian schools pursuant to the subpoenas are attached hereto as Exhibits I(1-41) in the following order:

Exhibit I(1) – Ascension School Materials

Exhibit I(2) – Archbishop James P. Luke – Materials for Schools of St. Catherine, St. Henry and St. Timothy

Exhibit I(3) – Blessed Sacrament School Materials

Exhibit I(4) – Corpus Christi School Materials

Exhibit I(5) – Holy Name Elementary School Materials

Exhibit I(6) – Holy Redeemer School Materials

Exhibit I(7) – Immaculate Conception School Materials

Exhibit I(8) – Metro Catholic Parish – Materials for Schools of Saint Boniface and Saint Stephen

Exhibit I(9) – Montessori School Holy Rosary

Exhibit I(10) –Our Lady of Good Counsel School Materials

Exhibit I(11) –Our Lady of Mount Carmel School Materials

Exhibit I(12) –Our Lady of Peace School Materials

Exhibit I(13) –Saint Adalbert School Materials

Exhibit I(14) –Saint Agatha – Saint Aloysius School Materials

Exhibit I(15) –Saint Francis School Materials

Exhibit I(16) – Saint Ignatius Elementary School Materials

Exhibit I(17) – Saint Jerome School Materials

Exhibit I(18) – Saint John Cantius School Materials

Exhibit I(19) – Saint John Nepomucene School Materials

Exhibit I(20) – Saint Leo the Great School Materials

Exhibit I(21) – Saint Joseph Collinwood School Materials

Exhibit I(22) – Saint Mark Catholic School Materials

Exhibit I(23) – Saint Mary Byzantine School Materials

Exhibit I(24) – Saint Mary School Materials

Exhibit I(25) – Saint Mel School Materials

Exhibit I(26) – Saint Patrick School Materials

Exhibit I(27) – Saint Rocco School Materials

Exhibit I(28) – Saint Stanislaus School Materials

Exhibit I(29) – Saint Thomas Aquinas – Saint Phillip School Materials

Exhibit I(30) – Saint Vitus School Materials

Exhibit I(31) – Saint Vincent DePaul School Materials

Exhibit I(32) – Villa Montessori Center

Exhibit I(33) – Luther Memorial School Materials

Exhibit I(34) – Saint John Nottingham Lutheran School Materials

Exhibit I(35) – Saint Mark Lutheran School Materials

Exhibit I(36) – West Park Lutheran Materials for Schools of Bethany, Holy Cross and Puritas

Exhibit I(37) – Ramah Junior Academy Materials

Exhibit I(38) – Calvary Center Academy Materials

Exhibit I(39) – Westside Baptist Christian School Materials

Exhibit I(40) – Second New Hope Christian Academy Materials

Exhibit I(41) – Cleveland Community Islamic School Materials

10. Plaintiffs also served a subpoena on the Roman Catholic Diocese of Cleveland ("Diocese"), seeking information regarding the directives and guidelines that the Diocese provides to Catholic schools within its jurisdiction. True and correct copies of several of the documents produced in response to said subpoena are attached hereto as Exhibits J(1-5) in the following order:

Exhibit J(1) – State of the Schools Report for 1998-99 and Mission Statement of the Office of Catholic Education of the Diocese

Exhibit J(2) – Kindergarten Guide by the Diocese

Exhibit J(3) – Handbook for Elementary Schools by the Diocese

Exhibit J(4) – Curriculum Guides by the Diocese for Language Arts, Religion, Science, Social Studies and Christian Formation in Sexuality

Exhibit J(5) – Article by Sister Carol Anne Smith describing mission of the schools within the Diocese

11. The plaintiffs and intervenors/defendants have stipulated that the documents produced by the Diocese of Cleveland "are authentic, [and] speak for themselves." That stipulation is attached hereto as Exhibit K.

/s/Alice O'Brien
ALICE O'BRIEN
Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-9340

Dated: October 27, 1999

Appendix NN

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DISTRICT

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1740
	:	
v.	:	JUDGE OLIVER
	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN,	:	
Defendant.	:	

SUE GATTON, et al.	:	
Plaintiffs	:	CASE NO. 1:99 CV 1818
	:	
v.	:	JUDGE OLIVER
	:	
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:	(CONSOLIDATED CASES)
Defendants.	:	

DEFENDANT, DR. SUSAN ZELMAN'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION

Defendant, Susan T. Zelman (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant") responds as follows to Plaintiff's request for documents and information set forth as Attachment A to memorandum dated September 10, 1999:

1. General Objections – Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' definitions to the extent that Plaintiffs try to distinguish the "1995 Cleveland Program" from the "1999 Cleveland Program". Defendant asserts that there has been one program which has continued from 1996-97 to the present.

2. Defendant objects to producing any documents that are not relevant to the issues pending in this proceeding or that would not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. By producing the information requested, Defendant does not concede the admissibility or relevance thereof.

3. Defendant objects to producing any documents protected from discovery by reason of the attorney-client privilege or work product immunity.

4. Defendant objects to any requests that imply that the State has classified or identified non-public school as being either sectarian or non-sectarian or religiously affiliated. To the extent that the State is producing information that identifies a school's religious affiliation such identification is based upon information provided to the State by the individual school and not based on any determination or evaluation performed by the State.

5. The data and information provided in response to this request changes on an ongoing basis when new information is received. Therefore, the figures and data are subject to change.

Respectfully submitted,

BETTY D. MONTGOMERY
Attorney General

/s/ Mary Lynn Readey
EDWARD B. FOLEY
State Solicitor
Mary Lynn Readey (0038591)
Roger F. Carroll (0023142)
Karen Lazorishak (0029587)
Assistant Attorneys General
Education Section
30 East Broad Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3428
(614) 466-7250

Counsel for State Defendants

ATTACHMENT A

REQUESTED DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION

1. Provide the name, address, and telephone number of each participating private school.

RESPONSE: The list of the 1999-2000 participating schools in the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program is provided.

2. For each participating private school, state whether said school is affiliated with a religious group, institution, or organization, and, if so, provide the name of the religious group, institution, or organization.

RESPONSE: The State objects to the extent that this request implies that the State has classified or made an independent determination of a non-public school's affiliation with a religious group, institution, or organization. Without waiving the objection, the State is providing a document entitled "Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program Religious Affiliation", which is based on information provided to the State by the individual schools. The State has never independently verified this information.

3. If a participating private school that is not affiliated with a religious group, institution, or organization includes a religious component in its educational program or day-to-day operation, provide the name of said school, and describe the nature of the religious component.

RESPONSE: The State does not have any information responsive to this request.

4. For each participating private school, (a) provide the total number of pupils enrolled during the CCSD 1999-2000 school year, and (b) provide the total number of pupils who are enrolled in said school under the 1999 Cleveland Program.

RESPONSE: (a) With the exception of five non-chartered, non-public school, the State is producing a document which provides the total enrollment for the 1998-1999 school year for all schools participating in the voucher program for the 1999-2000 school year. The State does not yet have total enrollment figures for the 1999-2000 school year. The State does not collect any information about the enrollment figures of non-chartered, non-public schools;

(b) The State is producing a document which provides that as of September 13, 1999, 3,062 students have continued in the voucher program for the 1999-2000 school year and identifies the school they are currently attending. Defendant is also providing a document which identifies the schools for the 794 new students enrolled in the program for the first time in the 1999-2000 school year. These students were admitted in the program and placed in their schools prior to the District Court's decision on August 24, 1999.

5. For each participating private school, provide any mission statements, parent handbooks, informational brochures, and other written material in your possession that have been prepared by said school that in any way describe its goals and objectives,

educational program, financial operation, and/or affiliations.

RESPONSE: The State has no documents responsive to this request.

6.(a) Provide copies of any rules, regulations, operating guidelines, directives, and other written materials that the State has issued, or provided to participating private schools and/or parents of pupils that are participating in the 1999 Cleveland Program for the CCSD 1999-2000 school year, that deal with the structure and operation of the 1999 Cleveland Program, including the eligibility of private schools to participate in, and the evaluation of, said Program.

(b) To the extent any rules, regulations, operating guidelines, directives and other information that was issued or provided in connection with the 1995 Cleveland Program is applicable to the 1999 Cleveland Program, so state and provide copies.

RESPONSE: (a) and (b)

1. The State is producing the Program Administration Procedures manual for the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program dated March, 1999.
2. A Comparative Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program year one: 1996-1997, dated, March 16, 1998 and prepared by Kim Metcalf, Ph.D. along with an executive summary.
3. Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program, second year report 1997-1998 dated, November 18, 1998 submitted by Dr. Kim Metcalf, with an executive summary.

4. Evaluation of Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program 1996-1999, dated September 1, 1999, submitted by Dr. Kim Metcalf, with an executive summary.
5. Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program special audit report, July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1998 with the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program responses to said report.
6. Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program final management study dated, September 9, 1999 by KPMG, LLP.

Additional document produced in response to item 11 is also responsive to this request.

7.(a) Provide copies of any application forms (together with attachments) or other written materials that any participating private school submitted to the State in order to participate in the 1999 Cleveland Program.

(b) To the extent any application forms (together with attachments) or other written materials that we submitted in order to participate in the 1995 Cleveland Program are applicable to the 1999 Cleveland Program, so state and provide copies.

RESPONSE: (a) and (b) The Defendant is producing the Assurance of Compliance with attached documents submitted by the schools participating in the program for the 1999-2000 school year.

8. State the total number of pupils who were awarded vouchers/scholarships to attend participating private schools for the CCSD 1999-2000 school year. Of that number, how many, as of the date of your answer, (a) did not actually attend a participating private school during the CCSD 1999-2000 school

year, and (b) left the participating private school they were attending.

RESPONSE: 4,984 scholarships were awarded to students for the 1999-2000 school year, 1,316 new scholarships were awarded and of these, 794 students enrolled in the program. Defendant does not have any information regarding if any of the new students who enrolled in the program have subsequently left. The District court has preliminarily enjoined the continued operation with regard to new students.

3,058 previous recipients are stilled enrolled in the program, 381 students who were previously enrolled in the program have withdrawn and the status of 229 students who were enrolled in the program is unknown at this time.

9. Provide copies of any and all more recent versions of the documents included in Exhibit CC to the July 27, 1999 Affidavit of Donald Mooney in Case No. CV 1818.

RESPONSE: The only update was prepared on July 22, 1999 for the 1999-2000 school year. However, this information is accurate only as of the date it was prepared. The collection of data and information is an ongoing process. Therefore the July 22, 1999 report does not necessarily accurately reflect the status of the program on this date.

10. Provide copies of:

(a) any memoranda, letters, or other written correspondence between the State and the "Cleveland Catholic Diocese School Principals" or the

"Superintendent of the Cleveland Diocese Schools." See Exhibits Z to the May 6, 1996 Affidavit of Donald Mooney in the state court litigation.

(b) any "legal opinion[s]" of the type referenced in Exhibit Z, supra, that have been reduced to writing and shared with third parties;

(c) the mailing list used by the State in correspondence with "Cleveland Catholic Diocese School Principals," or, in lieu thereof, a list of participating private schools that are affiliated with the Cleveland Catholic Diocese; and

(d) any documents in your possession prepared by the Cleveland Catholic Diocese, that describe the mission, objectives, education programs, and/or financial operation of schools that are affiliated with the Diocese or of the Diocese itself.

RESPONSE: (a), (b), (c) and (d) The State has no documents responsive to this request.

11. Have any "information sessions" of the type referenced in Exhibit N to the March 15, 1996 Affidavit of Donald Mooney in the state court litigation been held by the State in connection with the operation of the 1995 or 1999 Cleveland Program during the CCSD 1999-2000 school year? If the answer is "yes", provide copies of any documents that were made available in connection with such sessions, and any documents describing the purposes and objectives of such sessions.

RESPONSE: The State is producing an agenda with attachments for an information meeting which occurred on April 26, 1997. The State is producing a notice of a meeting that took place on March 26, 1998. The State cannot locate any documents concerning this meeting. The State is producing an agenda with attachments for parent/guardian information session dated April 17, 1999.

12. State the total number of pupils who were awarded vouchers/scholarships to attend participating private schools for the CCSD 1999-2000 school year who attended a private school during the school year prior to the first school year that they received a voucher/scholarship.

RESPONSE: The July 22, 1999 report total 1999-2000 enrollment, public, private, existing under response 9 provides information on where the voucher recipients attended schools before enrolling in the scholarship program. Any new information received after July 22, 1999 would not be reflected in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

BETTY D. MONTGOMERY
Attorney General

/s/ Mary Lynn Readey
EDWARD B. FOLEY
State Solicitor
Mary Lynn Readey (0038591)
Roger F. Carroll (0023142)
Karen Lazorishak (0029587)
Assistant Attorneys General
Education Section
30 East Broad Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3428
(614) 466-7250

Counsel for State Defendants

[Exhibits B(2), B(3), B(4), B(5) and B(6) are omitted by agreement of the parties.]

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
L.L.P.
Counsellors at Law
1300 Huntington Center
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

September 23, 1999

David G. Latanick, Esq.
Cloppert, Portman, Sauter, Latanick & Foley
225 East Broad Street
P.O. Box 1810
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: Sue Gatton, et al. v. Zelman, et al. and Doris Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Zelman, et al.
Case Nos. 1:99CV1818 and 1:99CV1740
(Judge Oliver)

Dear Dave:

Sorry that, when I provided the Mission Statements, I did not include a list reflecting the religious affiliation of participating schools. I am faxing herewith two separate lists. The first list reflects the religious affiliation of all participating schools other than the Catholic schools. However, there is one caveat. It was our understanding that Birchwood had a Christian affiliation. We will try to investigate that matter further and, if we obtain any more definitive information, we will let you know. The Mission Statement we obtained reflected Christian affiliation.

The second list is simply a itemization of all of the participating schools that have Catholic sponsorship.

If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Very Truly Yours,

David J. Young

DJY:jfg
Enclosure

cc: Andrew Roth, Esq.

CLEVELAND SCHOLARSHIP AND TUTORING PROGRAM
1999-2000 PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF SCHOOLS
(other than Catholic schools)

	Name of School	Religiously affiliated?	Affiliation
1)	Birchwood ES	Y	Christian
2)	Calvary Center Academy ES	Y	Christian; member: Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI); sponsorship: Cleveland Apostolic Ministerial Fellowship
3)	Cleveland Community Islamic School	Y	Islamic
4)	Covenant Kindergarten School	Y	Christian
5)	Hanna Perkins School	N	
6)	Hough Brooks Academy	N	
7)	Lewis Little Folks, Inc.	N	

8) Luther Memorial School	Y	Lutheran, member: Lutheran Schools of Ohio (LSO); supported by area Lutheran churches
9) Marotta Montessori Schools (3)	N	
10) Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten (2)	Y	Christian (Board of Directors composed of area clergy)
11) Ramah Junior Academy	Y	Seventh Day Adventist
12) St. John Nottingham	Y	Lutheran, member: LSO
13) St. Mark Lutheran ES	Y	Lutheran, member: LSO
14) Second New Hope Christian School	Y	Christian
15) West Park Lutheran School	Y	Lutheran, member: LSO; sponsored by 4 Lutheran congregations
16) Westside Baptist Christian	Y	Christian, member: ACSI; sponsorship: 5 Madison Avenue Baptist churches

CATHOLIC AFFILIATION OR SPONSORSHIP

School Name

Archbishop—St. Catherine
Archbishop—St. Henry
Archbishop—St. Timothy
Ascension
Blessed Sacrament
Corpus Christi
Holy Name
Holy Redeemer
Immaculate Conception
Metro Catholic
Our Lady Good Counsel
Our Lady Mt. Carmel
Our Lady of Peace
St. Adalbert
St. Agatha/Aloysius
St. Francis
St. Ignatius
St. Jerome
St. John Cantius
St. John Nepomucene
St. Joseph Collinwood
St. Leo the Great
St. Mark
St. Mary Byzantine
St. Mary Collinwood
St. Mel
St. Patrick
St. Rocco
St. Stanislaus
St. Thomas/Phil
St. Vincent de Paul
St. Vitus
Villa Montessori

BREDHOFF & KAISER, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys & Counselors
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5398
(202) 833-9340
Facsimile: (202) 833-5588

September 24, 1999

By Facsimile & Regular U.S. Mail

Edward B. Foley
State Solicitor for Ohio
Office of the Ohio Attorney General
30 East Broad Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3428

Re: **Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Tave Zelman, Case No. 1:99 CV 1740**

Dear Mr. Foley:

On Wednesday, September 22, 1999, we received Defendant's Responses to Plaintiffs' Request for Documents and Information ("Responses") in the above-referenced matter. The documents that the State produced with the Responses appear to respond in full to plaintiffs' requests, and we appreciate your cooperation during this informal stage of the discovery process. There are, however, a few minor points on which we seek clarification from you:

1. There are two schools – Hough Brooks Academy and Lewis Little Folks, Inc. – which are included on the list the State produced entitled "Cleveland Scholarship & Tutoring Program 1999-2000 Participating Schools,"

but not on the lists of participating schools showing current enrollment in the school voucher program (*i.e.*, the lists produced in response to Plaintiffs' Request No. 4(b)). We assume this is because no students are currently attending these two schools under the 1999 Cleveland Program. Please confirm that this is the case or, if it is not, explain the apparent inconsistency between the lists.

2. There are two other schools – Ascension School and Islamic School of Oasis – that are included on the lists of participating schools showing current enrollment in the 1999 Cleveland Program but which are not included on the list entitled "Cleveland Scholarship & Tutoring Program 1999-2000 Participating Schools." As the documents reflect that students are now attending these two schools under the Program, we assume that they inadvertently were omitted from the list of participating schools. Please confirm that this is the case or, if it is not, explain the apparent inconsistency between the lists.

3. In response to Plaintiffs' Request No. 4(b) – asking for the "total number of pupils who are enrolled [in a participating private school] under the 1999 Cleveland Program" – the State stated it was producing "a document which provides that as of September 13, 1999, 3,062 students have continued in the voucher program." The list that the state produced, however, is dated September 22, 1999, and reflects a total enrollment of 3,058 pupils in participating private schools. Please confirm

that this list is the one that was mistakenly identified as the list of September 13, 1999. In addition, please confirm that this list reflects the total number of pupils now enrolled in participating private schools under the 1999 Cleveland Program, who previously attended those schools under the program that was in effect during prior school years.

4. Enclosed are copies of the various documents that David Young has provided to us regarding the religious affiliations and missions of the participating private schools. We are forwarding these documents to you because it is unclear whether they were previously provided to you. We understand, based on your prior representations, that the State will not contest the accuracy of the list provided by Mr. Young regarding the religious affiliations of the participating private schools. To prevent any future misunderstandings, we ask that you confirm that understanding by way of a letter to us.

As we previously have indicated to you, in the coming weeks we will be pursuing limited formal discovery against the participating private schools. We will, of course, provide you with appropriate notice of that discovery when it occurs.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Chanin
Andrew D. Roth
Counsel for Plaintiffs
Doris Simmons-Harris, *et al.*

Enclosure: Documents provided by David Young
on behalf of the Hanna Perkins' Intervenors

cc (by mail w/o enclosures):
Counsel for Plaintiffs Sue Gatton, *et al.*
Counsel for Taylor Intervenors
Counsel for Hanna Perkins' Intervenors

Attorney General
Betty D. Montgomery

September 29, 1999

VIA FAX & REGULAR MAIL

Robert H. Chanin
Bredhoff & Kaiser, PLLC
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1300
Washington, D.C. 20036

Re: Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Dr. Zelman

Dear Bob:

I am responding to your letter dated September 24, 1999, regarding the State's response to your request for information:

1. You are correct in assuming that there are no Cleveland Scholarship students attending Hough Brooks Academy and the Lewis Little Folks, Inc.

2. After initially participating in the scholarship program, the Ascension School decided that it did not want to take any new scholarship students. Ascension also asked the scholarship office not to list it as a participating school. However, it agreed to allow the scholarship students who originally enrolled in their school to continue at the school. Accordingly, the scholarship office

complied with Ascension's request and took it off the list of schools participating in the program, even though it still has scholarship students attending their school.

The Islamic School of the Oasis is no longer participating in the program. Accordingly, there are no scholarship students attending the Islamic School of the Oasis. The Scholarship office is still verifying whether the students listed as attending the Islamic school have enrolled in other participating schools or have simply left the program.

3. As of September 22, 1999, the enrollment of students continuing in the scholarship program was 3,058. This is the most current information available. However, as mentioned in our written response this is subject to change as the office continues to update its data base.

4. You are correct in stating that the State will not contest the accuracy of the list provided by Mr. Young regarding the religious affiliation of the participating private schools. However, in the information provided to the scholarship office, Birchwood and the Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten Schools identified themselves as being non-denominational. It is my understanding that Mr. Young will pursue this issue further to determine if these schools have a religious affiliation. To the extent that the intervenors contest the religious affiliation of any participating private school, the state will simply abstain from this dispute.

If you have any further questions regarding the foregoing, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Betty D. Montgomery
Attorney General

Roger F. Carroll (0023142)
Assistant Attorney General
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone: (614) 644-7250
Fax: (614) 644-7634

RFC:gsz

cc: Marvin E. Frankel
David Young
Clint Bolick

BREDHOFF & KAISER, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys & Counselors
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5398
(202) 833-9340
Facsimile: (202) 833-5588

October 12, 1999

By Facsimile & Regular U.S. Mail
Roger F. Carroll
Assistant Attorney General
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: **Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Tave Zelman, Case No. 1:99 CV 1740**

Dear Roger:

Thank you for your letter dated September 29, 1999 clarifying the points raised in our letter to your office dated September 24, 1999. Upon further review of the material and data that you have provided to us, we seek clarification regarding three additional – and relatively minor – points, in order that the record for purposes of the summary judgment motion in these cases will be complete and fully accurate.

1. There is one additional school – the Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten – Brackland – that is included on the list the State produced entitled "Cleveland Scholarship & Tutoring Program 1999-2000 Participating Schools" but not on the lists of participating schools showing current enrollment in the school voucher program (*i.e.*, the lists produced in response to Plaintiffs' Request No. 4(b)). We assume this is because no students are currently attending

that school under the 1999 Cleveland Program. Please confirm that this is the case or, if it is not, explain the apparent inconsistency between the lists.

2. On the list of participating schools showing the enrollment of voucher students in those schools who did not attend those schools under the prior version of the voucher program (*i.e.*, "new voucher students"), Saint Mel is listed twice, once showing an enrollment of one new voucher student, and once showing an enrollment of 16 new voucher students. We assume that the actual number of new voucher students enrolled in the school is 17. Please confirm that this is the case or, if it is not, explain the apparent inconsistency in the list.

3. Because the Islamic School of Oasis is no longer participating in the school voucher program, we assume that the total number of students enrolled in participating schools should be reduced accordingly bringing the total number of students enrolled in school voucher program to 3,798 students.

Sincerely,

Robert Chanin
Andrew Roth
Alice O'Brien

cc: Clint Bolick, Esq.
Marvin Frankel, Esq.
David Young, Esq.

Attorney General
Betty D. Montgomery

October 19, 1999

Robert H. Chanin
Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1300
Washington, D.C. 20036

VIA FAX 202-833-5588
and Regular Mail

Re: ***Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Zelman***

Dear Bob:

I am responding to your letter dated October 12, 1999, seeking additional clarification regarding the State's production of documents:

1. There are no students presently attending the Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten, Brackland.

2. At the time the data was generated, St. Mel had 17 new voucher students.

3. You assumption regarding the current status of the students who attended the Islamic School of the Oasis, is not necessarily correct. These students may have enrolled in another scholarship school. Such information may not yet have been provided to the scholarship office at the time the data was generated. It is also possible that these students have withdrawn from the program. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to simply reduce the students who

formerly attended the Islamic school from the total number of students enrolled in the program.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Betty D. Montgomery
Attorney General

Roger F. Carroll
Assistant Attorney General
Education Section

cc: Clint Bolick
Marvin Frankel
David Young

BREDHOFF & KAISER, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys & Counselors
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5393
(202) 833-9340
Facsimile: (202) 833-5588

October 12, 1999

By Facsimile & Regular U.S. Mail

David Young
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, L.L.P.
1300 Huntington Center
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: **Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Tave Zelman, Case No. 1:99 CV 1740**

Dear Mr. Young:

We are writing to seek written confirmation from you that the attached list entitled "Participating Schools in the 1999-2000 Cleveland Scholarship Showing Religious Affiliation of Each School" accurately reflects the religious affiliations of those schools that are now participating in the 1999 Cleveland Scholarship Program and in which school voucher students are now enrolled.

The attached list was compiled from the information provided by the State regarding the schools participating in the program and in which voucher students are now enrolled, and from the information provided by you regarding the religious affiliation of each participating school. In those few instances in which the data that you provided does not

precisely match that provided by the State, we have made the following adjustments in the list to account for those discrepancies.

1. We have omitted from the list those schools that are participating in the program but in which no voucher students are currently enrolled – *i.e.*, Hough Brooks Academy, Lewis Little Folks, and Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten – Brackland.

2. We have listed as separate schools those schools that have two or more different locations – *i.e.*, the three West Park Lutheran Schools (Bethany, Holy Cross and Puritas) and the three Marotta Montessori Schools (Stokes, Fruitland and Glenville) – as the State did on their lists.

3. Two schools – Montessori School – Holy Rosary and the Golden Christian Academy – were included on the State's lists of participating schools but were omitted from your list showing the religious affiliations of participating schools. We have included those schools on the attached list with the religious affiliation information that was provided by the State.

4. We have included on the list the religious affiliation information that you provided to us for Birchwood Elementary School and the Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten – Superior, although we understand based on subsequent correspondence from both the State and the Institute for Justice that there may be some

question with respect to the religious affiliations of these schools.

After you have had an opportunity to review the attached, please let us know if it accurately reflects the religious affiliations of each of the schools participating in the school voucher program. If not, please identify the discrepancies so that we will have a fully accurate record for purposes of the summary judgment motion in these cases.

Sincerely,

Robert Chanin
Andrew Roth
Alice O'Brien

Enclosure List of Participating Schools Showing Religious Affiliation of Each School

cc: Clint Bolick, Esq.
Edward Foley, Esq.
Marvin Frankel, Esq.

Participating Schools in the 1999 Cleveland Scholarship Program Showing Religious Affiliation of Each School

School	Religious Affiliation
1. Ascension	Catholic
2. Archbishop James P. Lyke – St. Catherine	Catholic
3. Archbishop James P. Lyke – St. Henry	Catholic
4. Archbishop James P. Lyke – St. Timothy	Catholic
5. Blessed Sacrament School	Catholic
6. Corpus Christi E S	Catholic
7. Holy Name Elementary	Catholic
8. Holy Redeemer	Catholic
9. Immaculate Conception	Catholic
10. Metro Catholic Parish – Saint Boniface	Catholic
11. Metro Catholic Parish – Saint Stephen	Catholic
12. Montessori School – Holy Rosary	Catholic
13. Our Lady of Good Counsel	Catholic
14. Our Lady of Mount Carmel	Catholic
15. Our Lady of Peace	Catholic
16. Saint Adalbert	Catholic
17. Saint Agatha – Saint Aloysius	Catholic
18. Saint Francis	Catholic
19. Saint Ignatius Elementary	Catholic
20. Saint Jerome	Catholic
21. Saint John Cantius	Catholic
22. Saint John Nepomucene	Catholic
23. Saint Leo the Great	Catholic
24. Saint Joseph Collinwood E S	Catholic
25. Saint Mark Catholic	Catholic
26. Saint Mary Byzantine	Catholic
27. Saint Mary Collinwood E S	Catholic
28. Saint Mel	Catholic
29. Saint Patrick W.P.	Catholic
30. Saint Rocco	Catholic

31. Saint Stanislaus	Catholic
32. Saint Thomas Aquinas – Saint Phillip	Catholic
33. Saint Vincent De Paul E S	Catholic
34. Saint Vitus School	Catholic
35. Villa Montessori Center	Catholic
36. Calvary Center Academy E S	Christian (Apostolic)
37. Westside Baptist Christian	Baptist
38. Golden Christian Academy	Christian
39. Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten - Superior	Christian
40. Second Hope Christian	Christian
41. Covenant Kindergarten School	Christian
42. Birchwood E S	Christian
43. Luther Memorial School	Lutheran
44. Saint John Nottingham Lutheran	Lutheran
45. Saint Mark Lutheran E S	Lutheran
46. West Park Lutheran School – Bethany	Lutheran
47. West Park Lutheran School – Holy Cross	Lutheran
48. West Park Lutheran School – Puritas	Lutheran
49. Ramah Junior Academy	Seventh Day Adventist
50. Cleveland Community Islamic School	Islamic
51. Hanna Perkins School	Non-Denominational
52. Marotta Montessori – Carl B. Stokes	Non-Denominational
53. Marotta Montessori – Fruitland	Non-Denominational
54. Marotta Montessori – Glenville	Non-Denominational

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
L.L.P.
Counsellors at Law
1300 Huntington Center
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

October 19, 1999

Robert Chanin, Esq.
Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Re: Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Zelman, et al.,
Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
Gatton, et al. v. Zelman, et al.,
Case No. 1:99 CV 1818

Dear Mr. Chanin:

We of course will attempt to agree upon a list reflecting the religious affiliation of the schools registered to participate in the Pilot Scholarship.

I have received a communication from Clint Bolick's office indicating that Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten, Covenant Kindergarten School and Birchwood are not religiously sponsored or affiliated. We could either list them as not religiously affiliated or we could place them in a category which would reflect a dispute as to whether they were or were not.

In any event, I would not want to list the private schools without religious affiliation under a religious affiliation caption with the designation non-denominational.

There should be two separate captions, one for religiously affiliated schools and the other for schools without religious affiliation.

I believe that the list should include all schools that are registered to participate regardless of whether parents have chosen them. The extent of available choice may be relevant. Thus, we should not eliminate these schools. When we include them, we could either put them under a separate caption or have an asterisk reflecting that there are no Scholarship students currently enrolled at those schools.

I am checking the two schools you indicated were not on our list to confirm their affiliation and will be in touch as soon as that confirmation is received.

As indicated previously, if there is any dispute concerning the extent of religious affiliation with respect to a specific school, that difference could be reflected in the list. This should not stand as a barrier to your having an appropriate list when you submit your Motion for Summary Judgment.

Very truly yours,

David J. Young

cc: Clint Bolick, Esq.
Ned Foley, Esq.
Marvin Frankel, Esq.
Donald Mooney, Esq.
David Latanick, Esq.
Stephen Williger, Esq.

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
L.L.P.
Counsellors at Law
1300 Huntington Center
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

October 27, 1999

Robert Chanin, Esq.
Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Re: Simmons-Harris, et al. v. Zelman, et al.,
Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
Gatton, et al. v. Zelman, et al.,
Case No. 1:99 CV 1818

Dear Mr. Chanin:

I responded earlier to your request about an agreed list reflecting religiously sponsored schools. You listed two schools that weren't included before. One of them, Golden Christian Academy, has since closed. The other, Holy Rosary, is operated on property leased from a Catholic parish and does not speak in its Mission Statement of a "Catholic atmosphere." However, it is not sponsored by or affiliated with a religious organization. Thus, we would not want to categorize it as such. Again, if you believe you would want to retain the right to argue that it is religiously affiliated or sponsored, we could put it along with the others where there is a difference of view.

Sincerely,

David J. Young

cc: Clint Bolick, Esq.
Ned Foley, Esq.
Marvin Frankel, Esq.
Donald Mooney, Esq.
David Latanick, Esq.

EXHIBIT E:
1999 Voucher Program
Information Regarding Participating Schools, Religious Affiliation and Student Enrollment

Participating Schools[1]	Religious Affiliation[2]	"Continuing" Voucher Enrollees[3]	New Voucher Enrollees[4]	Total Voucher Enrollees
1. Ascension School	Catholic	28	0	28
2. Archbishop James P. Lyke-St. Catherine School	Catholic	58	52	110
3. Archbishop James P. Lyke-St. Henry School	Catholic	185	25	210
4. Archbishop James P. Lyke-St. Timothy School	Catholic	74	12	86
5. Blessed Sacrament School	Catholic	68	12	80
6. Corpus Christi School	Catholic	22	11	33
7. Holy Name Elementary School	Catholic	62	6	68

8.	Holy Redeemer School	Catholic	69	24	93
9.	Immaculate Conception School	Catholic	46	18	64
10.	Metro Catholic Parish-Saint Boniface School	Catholic	48	22	70
11.	Metro Catholic Parish-Saint Stephen School	Catholic	146	18	164
12.	Montessori School-Holy Rosary School	Catholic	8	3	11
13.	Our Lady of Good Counsel School	Catholic	107	12	119
14.	Our Lady of Mount Carmel School	Catholic	45	14	59
15.	Our Lady of Peace School	Catholic	90	22	112
16.	Saint Adalbert School	Catholic	110	24	134
17.	Saint Agatha-Saint Aloysius School	Catholic	84	26	110
18.	Saint Francis School	Catholic	89	21	110
19.	Saint Ignatius Elementary School	Catholic	101	18	119

20. Saint Jerome School	Catholic	53	21	74
21. Saint John Cantius School	Catholic	16	1	17
22. Saint John Nepomucene School	Catholic	21	7	28
23. Saint Joseph Collinwood School	Catholic	61	26	87
24. Saint Leo the Great School	Catholic	52	7	59
25. Saint Mark Catholic School	Catholic	13	0	13
26. Saint Mary Byzantine School	Catholic	33	2	35
27. Saint Mary Collinwood School	Catholic	73	22	95
28. Saint Mel School	Catholic	66	17	83
29. Saint Patrick School	Catholic	62	8	70
30. Saint Rocco School	Catholic	51	15	66
31. Saint Stanislaus School	Catholic	107	29	136
32. Saint Thomas Aquinas-Saint Phillip School	Catholic	146	31	177
33. Saint Vincent De Paul School	Catholic	79	27	106

34. Saint Vitus School	Catholic	89	44	133
35. Villa Montessori Center School	Catholic	0	3	3
36. Calvary Center Academy School	Christian	38	16	54
37. Second New Hope Christian Academy	Christian	168	38	206
38. Westside Baptist Christian School	Baptist	40	4	44
39. Luther Memorial School	Lutheran	72	12	84
40. Saint John Nottingham Lutheran School	Lutheran	35	7	42
41. Saint Mark Lutheran School	Lutheran	36	11	47
42. West Park Lutheran School-Bethany	Lutheran	10	1	11
43. West Park Lutheran School-Holy Cross	Lutheran	23	6	29
44. West Park Lutheran School-Puritas	Lutheran	5	1	6
45. Ramah Junior Academy	Seventh Day Adventist	57	23	80

46. Cleveland Community Islamic School	Islamic	59	8	67
47. Birchwood School	Non-Denominational	17	0	17
48. Covenant Kindergarten School	Non-Denominational	2	3	5
49. Hanna Perkins School	Non-Denominational	1	3	4
50. Marotta Montessori School-Carl B. Stokes	Non-Denominational	0	4	4
51. Marotta Montessori School-Fruitland	Non-Denominational	1	7	8
52. Marotta Montessori School-Glenville	Non-Denominational	57	12	69
53. Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten-Superior	Non-Denominational	7	15	22
54. Ministerial Full Day Kindergarten-Brackland	Non-Denominational	0	0	0
55. Hough Brooks Academy	Non-Denominational	0	0	0

56. Lewis Little Folks School	Non-Denominational	0	0	0
TOTAL		2990	771	3761

Source Notes for Exhibit E

1. Participating Schools

The List of schools participating in the 1999 Voucher Program is taken from the list produced by the State of those schools (see Exhibit B(2)), as modified in two respects. First, one school – the Ascension School – has been included as a participating school on the basis of the State's representation that the school is currently participating in the Voucher Program. See Exhibit D, Letter of Roger F. Carroll to Robert H. Chanin dated September 29, 1999. Second, two schools – the Islamic School of the Oasis ("Islamic School") and the Golden Christian Academy – have been omitted from the list of participating schools based on the State's representation that the Islamic School is no longer participating in the Voucher Program, see id., and the representation of the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants that the Golden Christian Academy has been closed. See id., Letter of David Young to Robert H. Chanin dated October 27, 1999.

2. Religious Affiliations

The religious affiliations of participating schools is taken from the lists reflecting those affiliations produced by the Hanna Perkins Intervenors (see Exhibit C) as modified in three respects. First, the religious affiliation of schools with multiple campuses – e.g., Metro Catholic Parish at Saint Boniface and Saint Stephen – has been listed separately for

each school campus. Second, the Montessori School Holy Rosary, which the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants contend is not religiously affiliated, see Exhibit D, Letter of David Young to Robert H. Chanin dated October 27, 1999, has been listed as a Catholic school based on its self-identification as such in its mission statement, see Exhibit I(9), as well as to the State, see Exhibit B(1) and B(3). Third, four schools initially identified by the Hanna Perkins Intervenors as religiously affiliated – Ministerial Full Day Kindergartens at Brackland and Superior, Covenant Kindergarten School, and Birchwood School – have been listed as non-denominational schools based on the documents received from those schools as well as subsequent correspondence received from the Hanna Perkins Intervenors/Defendants and the State. See Exhibit D, Letter of David Young to Robert H. Chanin dated October 19, 1999; id., Letter of Roger Carroll to Robert H. Chanin dated September 29, 1999.

3. "Continuing" Voucher Enrollees

The number of students attending a participating school under the 1999 Voucher Program who previously attended that school under the 1995 Voucher Program is taken from Exhibit B(5).

4. "New" Voucher Enrollees

The number of students attending a participating school under the 1999 Voucher Program who did not participate in the 1995 Voucher Program is taken from Exhibit B(6).

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DISTRICT

DORIS SIMMONS-HARRIS, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	Case No. 1:99 CV 1740
	:	
v.	:	Judge Oliver
	:	Magistrate Judge
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN,	:	Perelman
Defendant,	:	
	:	
and	:	
	:	
HANNA PERKINS SCHOOL, et al.,	:	
Intervening Defendants.	:	

SUE GATTON, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	Case No. 1:99 CV 1818
	:	
v.	:	Judge Oliver
	:	Magistrate Judge
DR. SUSAN TAVE ZELMAN, et al.,	:	Perelman
Defendants,	:	(CASES)
	:	
and	:	
	:	
HANNA PERKINS SCHOOL, et al.,	:	
Intervening Defendants.	:	

STIPULATION

The parties stipulate as follows:

1. The Plaintiffs and Intervenor/Defendants stipulate that the handbooks, mission statements and Scholarship Program brochures produced by the schools participating in the Cleveland Scholarship Program are authentic, speak for themselves, have been made available to the parents of the Scholarship students and are not false or misleading. Some of these documents, however, may not accurately reflect admission standards that had to be revised to comply with **R.C. § 3313.977**.

2. The Defendants reserve the right to produce evidence concerning the students and teachers, demographics, secular educational mission and achievements and Scholarship pupil enrollment at these schools.

3. In lieu of stipulating to these facts, counsel for Defendant Zelman has provided the attached correspondence.

/s/Donald J. Mooney, Jr.
Donald J. Mooney, Jr.
Benesch, Friedlander,
Coplan & Aronoff LLP
2800 Cincinnati Commerce
Center
600 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2409
Tel: (513) 762-6271

/s/Robert H. Chanin
Robert H. Chanin
Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.P.
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1300
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 833-9340
Fax: (202) 833-5588
Counsel for Simmons-Harris

Fax: (513) 762-6245 **Plaintiffs**
Counsel for Gatton Plaintiffs

/s/David J. Young
David J. Young
Squire, Sanders &
Dempsey L.L.P.
41 S. High Street, Suite 1300
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Tel: (614) 365-2700
Fax: (614) 365-2499
Counsel for Intervenor/ Defendants Hanna Perkins School, et al.

/s/Clint Bolick, Esq.
Clint Bolick, Esq.
Institute for Justice
1717 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 955-1300
Fax: (202) 955-1329
Counsel for Intervenor/ Defendants Senel Taylor, et al.

Attorney General
Betty D. Montgomery

October 6, 1999

VIA FACSIMILE

Honorable Marvin E. Frankel
Kramer, Levin, Naftalis & Frankel, L.L.P.
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Robert H. Chanin, Esq.
Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Judge Frankel and Mr. Chanin:

We are in receipt of Mr. Mooney's proposed Stipulation between Plaintiffs and Intervenor/Defendants. In lieu of our signing this Stipulation, we hope that you will find the following representations satisfactory to avoid the need for depositions in this case:

1. The State is in no position to contest the authenticity of Mission Statements provided by Defendant/Intervenors.

2. Nor is the State in a position to know whether or not a private school's Mission Statement accurately reflects the internal operations of the school, except to the extent that a Mission Statement may contradict information that a

school provides to the State pursuant to its legitimate and secular regulation of the school.

3. The State also is in no position to know whether or not a school provides its Mission Statement to parents of students who participate in the Scholarship Program, except to the extent that a school may provide its Mission Statement as part of any obligation the school might have to provide information about itself to Program participants.

That said, we should let you know that we consider it inappropriate to invoke the coercive power of the federal judiciary to inquire into the extent to which a religiously affiliated private school engages in religious practices or religious instruction. As long as any private school (whether religiously affiliated or otherwise) serves the secular purposes of the State's compulsory education laws and its Scholarship Program – teaching students reading, math, civics, and so forth – it should be no business of the State's (or the federal judiciary's) whether or how much religious activity or instruction also occurs at the school. Any such official inquiry into private religious affairs seems out of keeping with the spirit of the "No Religious Test" clause of the Constitution, as well as the First Amendment.

We look forward to your response to this letter.

Sincerely,

Edward B. Foley
State Solicitor

cc: Clint Bolick
David Young

Appendix OO

ASCENSION SCHOOL

Excerpts from Ascension Family Handbook 1999-2000

Philosophy of Ascension of Our Lord School

We, the members of Ascension School, believe that every child is a unique gift created by God, redeemed in Jesus, and filled with the Holy Spirit. We believe each child has an eternal destiny as invited by a loving God, and that as part of the community of faith, we are called to nurture growth and development in that child. The entire school community, in communion with the full cooperation of the parents, parish leadership and staff, and all involved in the educational process, do everything in their power to provide the children with a well-planned instructional program which brings alive the love of God and the love of learning in each one. We believe it is by proclaiming, celebrating, and living the message of Jesus that children discover meaning and direction in life; that they are enabled to face the multiple challenges of life; that they develop those virtues and habits of the heart and mind required to be of effective service to others. In this way they are encouraged to have a faith that is "living, conscious, and active."

We endeavor to provide each child with a well-rounded curriculum that touches all aspects of the human person. We encourage in each a desire to excel to one's highest potential, to love the Lord and His teachings, and to serve others. We strive to form an authentic Christian community that models those virtues and characteristics we hope to affirm in others.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

Religious Instruction

The religious instruction of the children is the major focus of the curriculum at Ascension. Religion classes are taught on a daily basis. The National Catechetical Directory is the norm for this instruction along with the curriculum guidelines from the Office of Catholic Education/Office of Catechetical Services. Students attend Mass as a school religious function. Parents are invited to participate in these liturgies as they are able. Mass is celebrated with various levels or the whole school on Wednesdays at 8:30 A.M. During those weeks in which there is a holy day of obligation, the students attend 8:30 A.M. holy day Mass instead of the Wednesday Mass.

Prayer is an important part of each day and is encouraged throughout the day. In addition to daily religious lessons that teach the basics of faith, students participate in special projects during liturgical seasons in order to increase their understanding and love of our Catholic traditions and provide them with opportunities to reach out to others in service and care.

(Page 22 of Handbook)

ARCHBISHOP JAMES P. LYKE – SCHOOLS OF ST. CATHERINE, ST. HENRY, AND ST. TIMOTHY

Excerpts from Archbishop Lyke School Handbook
For St. Catherine, St. Henry, and St. Timothy Schools

Mission Statement

Archbishop Lyke School, founded on the heritage of the Catholic faith and the spirit of Archbishop James Patterson Lyke, will, with the help of parents and community, educate our children in Gospel and moral values by developing their academic, spiritual, and emotional potential in a safe and caring environment that fosters faith, respect, responsibility, and challenge.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Educational Objectives

1. Providing religious instruction and opportunities for participation in prayer and the liturgy.
2. Assisting each student to reach academic potential appropriate to his/her age, grade and God-given abilities.
3. Imparting the message of Jesus Christ in such a way so as to enable all to live the Gospel message.
4. Aiding the students to become competent in their decision-making and assisting them in the development of a sense of a responsibility to self and others.
5. Creating in each child a Christian awareness of his/her responsibility to serve others through involvement in a diversified society.
6. .....

(Page 2 of Handbook)

Christian Formation

Religion classes focusing on the Catholic Faith are taught daily for at least thirty minutes in all grades. A Christian attitude and response is expected of all students, and weekly worship at the Church of their professed faith is expected. Students are involved in service projects throughout the year. Students are exposed to prayer throughout the day, and they participate in prayer services and Liturgies in Church.

(Page 12 of Handbook)

BLESSED SACRAMENT SCHOOL

Blessed Sacrament School Handbook

Mission Statement for Blessed Sacrament School

Be it known to all who enter here that Christ is the reason for this school. The unseen, but ever present, teacher in its classes, the model of its faculty, the inspiration of its students.

All who enter here will use their lessons of love, peace, and understanding to reach their individual academic potential and become responsible citizens within their community.

Religious Program

In keeping with the philosophy of our school, the truths of Catholicism are presented daily in many and varied ways:

- Formal religion classes are held daily.
- Children plan and participate in worship services.
- Prayer is said daily in the classroom.
- Mission projects and contributions designed to help those less fortunate (both in our country and foreign nations) are encouraged.
- Where appropriate and relevant, the academic program reference is made to Christian teaching.
- Motivation for proper conduct and interpersonal relationships finds its reference in the example of Christ.
- The discipline code is rooted in a respect for the rights of each individual as a unique and special child of God.
- Christianity cannot be lived only five days a week! We are only partners with you, the parents, in all educational endeavors, including the spiritual development of your children. You are urged to be an example for your

children in Christian living and be active members of your religious community.

(Page 3 of Handbook)

Mass

By the celebrating of the Eucharist, all members of the parish are made one in Christ. An appreciation and understanding of the Mass grows through participation. Therefore, it is expected that all students attend a weekly school Mass and attend special Masses on Holy Days. Students may be asked to plan and participate in the school liturgies during the school year as part of their religious understanding of the Catholic faith.

(Page 18 of Handbook)

CORPUS CHRISTI SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent/Student Handbook 1999-2000 School Year

School Philosophy

The primary purpose of Corpus Christi is to teach the Gospel message of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, to build a Catholic Christian community and to prepare the students for Christian service.

With this in mind, Corpus Christi School, in cooperation with the Parents, the community and the Church, strives at the total development of the student's spiritual, intellectual, moral, social and physical growth. It endeavors to promote Christian attitudes and practices which will enable the students to adapt to our ever-changing society.

Goals

1. To communicate the Gospel message of Jesus Christ through students' prayer life, Sacramental life, moral leadership and active participation in the worshipping Community.
2. To assist students in their priorities in living a Christ-centered life.
3. To empower students to participate as Disciples of Jesus' Mission of transforming our world into a place of peace, justice and love.
4. To provide opportunities for students to develop responsibility, leadership and service based on Gospel principles.
5. To promote respect for self, others and the environment.
6. To motivate students to develop their knowledge and skills in the prescribed academic subject areas of the Curriculum.

7. To encourage and promote life-long skills.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Religious Education

Because the family is the first to provide an atmosphere of love of God and neighbor by following the teachings of the Church, the School aims to continue and nurture these same values.

Formal Religion classes are taught in all Grades K-8. One half hour is given daily to Catholic Doctrine instruction or liturgy. Kindergarten has a shorter time period daily. Students in grades 5, 6, 7, and 8 will participate in the 8:00 a.m. daily mass beginning October 1st unless a school mass is scheduled.

(Page 8 of Handbook)

Prayer

Besides the Mass, the children will participate in other paraliturgical services. These prayer services enable the students to participate in different types of prayers. Prayer will be offered daily in the classroom in a variety of ways.

(Page 8 of Handbook)

HOLY NAME ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Excerpts from Handbook for Parents and Students

Philosophy

Holy Name Elementary School Philosophy is based in the Catholic Philosophy of Education. We consider the whole child in the educational program as we follow the directive "To Teach as Jesus Did."

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Curriculum

The school follows the Diocesan Curriculum for all subjects including Religion.

Religion

Holy Name is a Catholic School. Parents who choose to have their children enrolled here must realize that Religion is part of their ordinary day.

(Page 6 of Handbook)

HOLY REDEEMER SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent-Student Handbook

Mission Statement

Holy Redeemer Parish School is a Catholic School committed to sharing the good news with all people while instilling a sense of knowledge and love of the Catholic faith and traditions. Together we strive for excellence in education.

Goals and Objectives

Holy Redeemer Catholic School educates students to: Strengthen and develop personal love for Christ by...

- Growing in a meaningful prayer life and understanding of Catholic beliefs, worship and moral teaching
- Forming a Christian conscience and developing decision-making skills based on Gospel values
- Developing positive attitudes of concern and respect for others
- Becoming involved in opportunities for Christian Service

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Curriculum

Religious Education Program

Religious classes are taught on Monday through Thursday for at least thirty minutes. On Friday of each week, students attend Mass at 8:00, as well as on Holy Days and special occasions. Parents are invited to celebrate these liturgies with us.

(Page 9 of Handbook)

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION SCHOOL
Excerpts from Parent Handbook

Philosophy of Catholic Education

Immaculate Conception School is an urban Catholic elementary school located in the city of Cleveland holding the following beliefs:

WE BELIEVE that we exist to proclaim and empower those we touch with the Gospel of Jesus

WE BELIEVE that because our greatest richness is our diversity of religious and cultural backgrounds, we strive to develop a sensitivity to and a recognition of the unique gifts that form us.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

Philosophy

To show that the message of Christ as proclaimed in the Gospel is accepted, we believe that the student should:

1. Learn the Christian doctrines and truths.
2. Commit himself/herself to the values of the Gospel.
3. Develop an appreciation of the worth and dignity of every person, including himself/herself.
4. Use religious truths to access the worth of other knowledge.
5. Give witness to the truths of the Gospel in his personal life.

To foster Christian community among the people with whom the student comes in contact, we believe that the student should:

1. Work to create an atmosphere of love within the students family.
2. Develop Christian fellowship with peers and teachers.
3. Participate actively in liturgical celebration.
4. Participate in the community life of the parish.

(Page 20 of Handbook)

Educational Goals

The student should:

1. Deepen personal awareness of God through directed experience.
2. Develop an appreciation of the personal worth and dignity of every person and the purpose of all creatures in the scheme of creation.
3. Commit oneself to a set of Christian values.
4. Acquire and use knowledge to make sound and independent judgements based on Christian principles.
5. Be a witness for Christ through growth in home life, in the parish community, in participation in the sacramental life of the Church and service to humanity.

(Page 21 of Handbook)

Religion

In order to instill in the students a greater awareness of their spiritual life, religion is incorporated into all areas of the curriculum. Various liturgical services are held both in the classroom and in the Church. In addition, students attend Mass once each Month and on all Holidays. Provision is made for Confession at stated times.

(Page 24 of Handbook)

METRO CATHOLIC PARISH – SCHOOLS OF SAINT BONIFACE & SAINT STEPHEN

Excerpts from Family Handbook revised 1999

Mission Statement

Sharing in the mission of Jesus: that all may be one, Metro Catholic Parish School is a family-oriented school that strives to educate the whole child, to evangelize and bring hope to families of the near west side through education and related family programs.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Philosophy of Metro Catholic Parish School

We, the members of Metro Catholic Parish School, believe that every child is a unique creation of God, our loving Father, is redeemed through Jesus, is filled with the Holy Spirit and has an eternal destiny. We are committed to each child's total education: in spirit, in body, in mind, in morals and value, in emotions, in social interactions. We believe that by proclaiming, celebrating, and living the message of Jesus, we can lead each child to a deeper sense of self-acceptance, and acceptance of God and others. We aim in Metro Catholic Parish School to integrate religious truths and values with the rest of life so that our children develop a sense of commitment to parish community, peace and justice, and respect for life in a very distinctly and obviously Catholic way. Therefore, the educational program at Metro Catholic Parish School is directed toward:

1. Aiding the student in becoming a knowing and loving Christian by:

a. Providing religious instruction in keeping with the child's intellectual capacity.

b. Providing opportunities for meaningful participation in the liturgy and for frequent reception of the sacraments.

c. Providing an environment of peace and justice that fosters growth of the Christian community.
d. Providing motivation and opportunity for Christian service in the home, school, and world community.
e. Providing motivation and opportunity for parent involvement to insure that continuation and development of spiritual growth in the total life experience of the child.
f. Providing motivation for the deepening involvement of the parish community to which the student belongs.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Instructional Program

The religious instruction of the child is the major focus of the curriculum of Metro Catholic. Prayer is an important part of each day and is encouraged throughout the day. In addition to daily religious lessons that teach the basics of faith, each child has the opportunity to attend Mass and receive the sacraments. During liturgical seasons other projects are undertaken to increase understanding and love of our traditions and faith.

(Page 3 of Handbook)

MONTESSORI SCHOOL – HOLY ROSARY

Excerpts from Operational Handbook

The Mission Statement of the Montessori School at Holy Rosary

The Montessori School at Holy Rosary is dedicated to providing outstanding educational instruction by discovering and awakening children's emerging potential and carefully cultivating the development of their innate talents and abilities. We are vitally committed to providing excellence in education to the children of Greater Cleveland through the philosophy and techniques of the Montessori method, provided in a Catholic atmosphere, enriched by the values of love, respect, and justice. The Montessori School at Holy Rosary is established to serve all children, regardless of race or creed, and is uniquely devoted to enhancing the vitality of Holy Rosary Parish and the Little Italy community.

(Page i of Handbook)

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL SCHOOL

Excerpts from Our Lady of Good Counsel School Student – Family Handbook 1996-1997

PHILOSOPHY

Our Lady of Good Counsel School is a Roman Catholic School in the tradition of the Missionaries of the Precious Blood. It shares the mission of the Church to reveal Christ to the world through evangelizing, participating, caring and celebrating the Gospel of Jesus.

Recognizing that each student is a unique individual, made in God's image, and worthy of respect, we strive to create an environment that is conducive to the spiritual, moral, intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development of each student committed to our care.

As an educational community, we strive to present a challenging curriculum that will help the students reach their full potential as Christian individuals and prepare them for living in the parish and other communities.

Our Lady of Good Counsel School believes that the students are the center of its educational mission.
This belief calls forth from the students the following responses:

1. A willingness to develop a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.
2. An active participation in the learning process so as to develop his/her own talents.
3. A growing acceptance of and sense of care and concern for others.
4. A developing sense of responsibility within various community: family, school, parish, city, nation, Church and world.

5. An openness to live the gospel values

(Page 3 of Handbook)

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM:

The Religious Education Program at Our Lady of Good Counsel School follows the principles and guidelines put forth in the 1979 National Catechetical Directory SHARING THE LIGHT OF FAITH. Pope John Paul II's letter CATECHESIS IN OUR TIMES, and the GUIDELINES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION by the Diocesan Office of Catholic Education.

Total Religious instruction is the major focus of the educational program at Our Lady of Good Counsel School. All students participate in the daily Religion classes that stress both the Doctrinal elements and the age-appropriate learning experiences for each grade level. This learning is reinforced by the Pastoral Staff when they visit the classrooms. Lessons learned in the formal Religion classes are purposefully carried over into all subject areas.

Prayer is a very important element intertwined within the teachings at every level. Throughout the program, students will not only be exposed to our traditional Catholic prayers, but will also be taught different methods of praying in order to deepen their own relationship with God as they mature in their faith.

(Page 12 of Handbook)

OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL SCHOOL

Excerpts from Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School
Parent – Student Handbook 1999-2000

Mission Statement

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School is a community dedicated to the Christian and academic development of the child. In light and spirit of Christ the redeemer, we promote the Christian family life according to the Roman Catholic and Mercedarian Tradition.

Our School emphasizes high expectations for spiritual and academic excellence as well as the social and physical well-being of each child. Catholic morals and ethical values are paramount in their holistic development.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School believes that the Redeeming presence of Christ in the Eucharist is the center and reflection of our lives. Our mission as Catholic educators is to guide our students to live their lives according to the example of Mary, our Mother of Mercy, and her son, Jesus Christ. We strive to ensure that this mission transcends the classroom and is reflected in our lifestyles.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School recognizes that differences exist in each child in the areas of development, motivation, aptitude, and achievement. Therefore, we commit ourselves to developing programs, learning theories and instructional strategies that will be effectively utilized to maximize learning time. It is our goal to develop leaders who will contribute theirs talents to the Church, the community, the country, and the family of nations.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

Religious Education

Roman Catholic Doctrine is an essential part of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School. Catholic Doctrine is presented as a living experience of knowledge and belief rather than just another subject. Students enjoy the opportunity to participate in weekly school Masses, Eucharistic Devotions, and the Sacrament of Penance as part of their religious education. This is in support of the parents'/guardians' privilege and responsibility of sharing the Faith. Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School requires family participation at special Liturgical Events celebrated throughout the school year. Attendance is part of the student's integral spiritual education. A special Family/School Mass is celebrated every First Sunday of the month at 11:30 a.m. Roman Catholics are expected to take active participation, while Non-Catholics participate by their very presence.

(Page 13 of Handbook)

OUR LADY OF PEACE SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent Handbook 1999-2000 School Year

Mission Statement

Our Lady of Peace School is a Catholic elementary school serving the Cleveland community for over seventy years. Parents, teachers, students and parishioners work together in a loving, supportive family environment.

We provide the finest education by using proven academic techniques rooted in the teaching of Jesus Christ.

Our goal, under the guidance and protection of Mary, the mother of God, is to continue to develop courageous and committed Christian leaders.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Statement of Philosophy

We the faculty of Our Lady of Peace School believe that as professional educators, we are here in a joint venture with the parents, who are the primary educators, and the community, in preparing each child to become mature, educated Christians.

This education should be a harmonious development of the spiritual, moral, physical, aesthetical, social and intellectual qualities. Under our guidance we hope that each child will develop a spirit of reverence for God, self, family, associates and all mankind; that each child will be inspired with a personal love for, and the need of God and will make this love for God more effective through the practice of religion in word and deed and especially through participation in his or her own faith community.

It is our goal to guide each child in the attainment of a knowledge of self. Talents will be nurtured, developed and used for the honor and glory of God and the physical well-being of the environment and the community.

(Page ii of Handbook)

Religious Formation

All students attending Our Lady of Peace Catholic School participate in religion lessons and liturgies including Mass, prayer services and other religious gatherings. Students have the opportunity to plan the liturgies and participate in them according to their abilities. ALL students MUST attend.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

SAINT ADALBERT SCHOOL

Excerpts from Student Handbook 1999-2000

The Philosophy of St. Adalbert School

St. Adalbert is a Christ-centered educational institution, a "Jesus School." All work consistently to promote an atmosphere wherein children can feel relaxed, loved, aware of Christ's presence, and are able to grow in the ability to cope with life as mature, responsible individuals. It is a place "to be," a place of peace which will enable students to build self-appreciation, responsibie behavior, and get to know a personal loving God. It is a community which cares, understands, and gives. Therefore, it is continually growing in Christianity, the Catholic Faith, and Black awareness. As family, we witness the present of Christ among us, the message of Jesus is taught, and service to others is shown here. The [illegible] working with the family builds on gospel values and principles. St. Adalbert is a place where children are free to develop physically, spiritually, psychologically and emotionally, and become open to all the possibilities within them.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

SAINT AGATHA – SAINT ALOYSIUS SCHOOL
Excerpts from St Agatha – St. Aloysius School Parent Student Handbook

MISSION STATEMENT

It is the purpose of St Agatha – St. Aloysius School to proclaim the message of the Gospel, to foster the growth of Christian Community, and to involve students in service to other. The school integrates religious truths and values with knowledge and skills during instruction and its activities in order to provide a quality education for its students.

The Catholic School exists to serve the educational mission of Christ and the Catholic Church through its evangelizing and catechizing ministry. As a Community of Faith, the school is called to impart the message of Jesus, form community, and to inspire service to our sisters and brothers.

Students in our school have the opportunities for the integration of faith, life and culture. We are committed to providing the environment and the program in which our students learn:

- Faith which they can relate to their life in the world and which affirms belief in the meaning of life and our relationship to God and to the world;
- Catholic teaching, tradition and spirituality;
- Deep respect for the intellectual values of knowledge, truth and wisdom;
- Appreciation and sensitivity for the gifts, culture and environment from which they come and respect the culture of others;

- Social awareness that impels to action on behalf of justice;
- Skills for community building;
- Personal growth in an atmosphere that fosters self-discipline;
- Responsibility for being contributing members of the local, national, and world community.

Both learning and growing in faith are essential activities in a Catholic school. Each student has the opportunity to develop their gifts and to become a more profoundly religious person because of education in our school.

(Page 2-3 of Handbook)

RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS

RELIGION

A 30 minute religion lesson is taught to each class daily. Lessons include content reading to traditional Catholic doctrine, moral behavior, devotions, scripture, prayer and liturgy. Prayer together begins each morning and ends each day. Children learn from the example of fine Catholic and Christian teachers the value of faith, community and respect of life. All students attending St Agatha – St. Aloysius School must participate in these religious activities.

(Page 10 of Handbook)

SAINT FRANCIS SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent-Student Handbook 1999-2000

MISSION STATEMENT

St. Francis Parish School
is a Catholic school
which promotes Catholic values, traditions
and morals.
We exist for Catholics
and for those seeking Gospel-centered
education.

We are a Catholic School which promotes Catholic values, traditions and morals. We exist for Catholics, for others seeking an alternative way of education, and as an evangelizing agent of the Church.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION POLICY

Students are required to participate in religion classes, prayer, and worship held during the school day. We model mutual respect for all religions and expect the students to do the same. We encourage all students to be active members of their churches. All students are encouraged to live according to the teachings of Jesus.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

SAINT IGNATIUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Excerpts from Home-School Handbook

"All those involved in a Catholic School, parents, pastor, teachers, administrators and students, must earnestly desire to make it a community of faith which is indeed living, conscious and active."

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Mission Statement

St. Ignatius Elementary School exists for the development of the whole person – the social, emotional, physical, cognitive and spiritual person. It is the mission of our school to nurture and guide our students in faith, beliefs, knowledge, and skills, so that the community as a whole may benefit from the students' moral guidelines, responsibility and knowledge instilling a sense of hope for the future while striving for excellence in education.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

Philosophy

The staff and administration of St. Ignatius desire that all student experience success in their academic pursuits in a climate of love and Christian community. We wish to inspire within each child the desire to become what he/she is potentially capable of being and to provide opportunities for understanding of self, others, the world, and our Creator. This goal requires combined home/school effort. In order to achieve this goal, we must have standards and procedures which provide the framework for maximum learning to occur.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

SAINT JEROME SCHOOL

Excerpts from Saint Jerome School Parent and Student Handbook 1999-2000

Saint Jerome School Philosophy

At St. Jerome School, we are educating God's noblest creation toward choosing a Christian life. In order to accomplish this end, we believe that:

FAITH must dominate the entire educational process so that the child can make decisions according to Catholic values and choose to lead a Christian life.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Educational Goals

Catholic education is intended to make faith become living, conscious, and active through the light of instruction...To teach as Jesus did.

We believe that:

- The Gospel message is at the core of our educational program, and as Catholic educators, we are to transmit the values of the Gospel message to those we serve
- The teaching of academic studies and skills is fully integrated with Catholic religious values and truths.
- The moral training of the child is begun at home by the parents and further guided within the Catholic school and gradually leads to a mature self-discipline.

We believe that:

- A Catholic community should foster in each child a sense of responsibility to others
- As each child grows in respect for self, that child will manifest by words and actions, respect for others

We believe that:

- Serving others is really sharing our time, talents and ourselves
- Catholic leadership grows through responsible service

(Page 1-2 of Handbook)

Religion

St. Jerome School is a Catholic School. All students, regardless of religious background, receive an average of 30 minutes per day of religion instruction in the Catholic faith, inclusive of class or school Masses. Prayers begin and end each day. Weekly Masses are arranged in which students participate and share in the planning. Other penance and prayer services are provided. Parents are invited to share in these celebrations with their children.

Parents should consider it a grave responsibility to see that their children attend Church regularly on Sunday. Church envelopes are given to the children to help them develop the habit of supporting their Church.

(Page 6-7 of Handbook)

SAINT JOHN CANTIUS SCHOOL

Excerpts from St. John Cantius School Student-Parent Handbook

Philosophy of Saint John Cantius School

St. John Cantius School, being an integral part of the Church of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Cleveland, strives to integrate the knowledge and practice of religious truths and values with the knowledge and skills of academic education.

Catholic Education at St. John Cantius School shares the Church's four-fold mission

1. Message
2. Community
3. Service
4. Worship

St. John Cantius School hopes to enable the students to learn to creatively exchange their experience and ideas, to think critically, and be responsible and accountable for their own actions.

St. John Cantius Schools aims to maintain and strengthen Christian moral and social values; to guide the students' individual, religious, psychological, intellectual and physical growth and development, with the help and cooperation of the parents who are the primary educators in the formation of these children.

In short, St. John Cantius School aims, with the help of Almighty God, to prepare real Christians, free and

responsible citizens, and socially mature individuals who will strive to:

1. Proclaim the message of the Gospel
2. Build a Parish-School community
3. Give of themselves to the service of others with Joy, Hope and Love.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

SAINT JOHN NEPOMUCENE SCHOOL

Excerpts from 1999-2000 Handbook

St. John Nepomucene School Mission Statement

We are committed to giving students the opportunity to grow in faith and academic excellence by their participation in liturgical and sacramental programs and by the development of their individual abilities and talents through diversified learning and extra-curricular activities which enables them to assume responsibility to family, Church and community.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

St. John Nepomucene School Philosophy

St. John Nepomucene School, in partnership with the Church, the St. John Nepomucene Parish community, our state and the family, provides a Catholic-Christian education through which the Gospel values are presented, lived and fostered.

The administration, faculty, and staff strive to:

- Provide a community and curriculum which meets the needs of the whole child,
- Model and develop leadership and service,
- Help students integrate religion through the values in their daily lives,
- Continue the tradition of academic excellence.

Objectives

St. John Nepomucene Catholic School educates students to:

Strengthen and develop personal love for Christ by...

- Growing in meaningful prayer life and understanding of Catholic beliefs, worship, and moral teaching,
- Forming a Christian conscience and developing decision-making skills based on Gospel values,
- Developing positive attitudes of concern and respect for others,
- Becoming involved in opportunities for Christian service.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

Curriculum

Religious Education Program:

Religion classes are taught daily for at least 30 minutes in all grades.

(Page 11 of Handbook)

SAINT JOSEPH COLLINWOOD SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent Handbook

Objectives

The role of our school is based upon these fundamental beliefs. The mission of our Catholic School serving the African-American community is a mission shared with all of our Catholic schools. Catholic education is a missionary of our local Catholic parishes. The Catholic School exists to serve the education mission of Christ through its evangelization and catechizing ministry. As a Community of Faith, the school is called to impart and nurture the message of Jesus, form community and inspire service to our sisters and brothers.

WE BELIEVE THAT ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL IS:
An INSTRUMENT

- By which WE AWAKEN the child's awareness of his relationship to God,
- By which WE DEVELOP faith values in the child through the teachings of Catholic/Christian doctrine based on Gospel values;
- By which WE PREPARE the child to successfully attain his destiny in the world to come, and to achieve success in growing and working toward a harmonious existence within a pluralistic society,
- By which WE COMMIT ourselves to create a setting within which both academic and moral education can occur.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

ST. LEO THE GREAT SCHOOL

Excerpts from Handbook

Philosophy of Saint Leo the Great School

Our philosophy begins with faith; faith in God, our Creator, faith in Jesus Christ, His Son; and faith in the Holy Spirit, our guiding light. The development and nurturing of this faith are brought about by following Christ's teachings and sharing His message through our daily actions.

We believe education begins with the family and is supported by the school and the parish community. The school shares in the family's responsibility of education by providing the structure for the student to grow in the love of God, to develop the unique talents that he/she possesses, and to learn the importance and responsibility of contributing and sharing as a member of the community.

We believe it is important for the students to develop a sense of self-worth and self-discipline, as well as a respect and love for others. Included with this respect and love is an awareness of the cultural differences among people, and a willingness to appreciate these differences in the light of oneness in God's family.

We believe that through the cooperation of the family and the school, each student may be able to realize a deep concerning for his/her brothers and sisters, thereby forming a personal response in truth, justice, and love that will guide him/her throughout life.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Faculty and Curriculum

All members of the faculty of St. Leo the Great are properly certified by the state of Ohio. The curriculum includes all subjects that are mandated by the state as well as religious instruction and regular participation in religious activities including attendance at Mass.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

SAINT MARK CATHOLIC SCHOOL

Excerpts from Handbook 1999-2000

Philosophy

St. Mark Catholic School, in partnership with the Church, the St. Mark parish community, our state and the family, provides a Catholic-Christian education through which Gospel values are presented, lived and fostered.

We believe each child is a unique person, a child of God, with individual traits and characteristics. The child has a right to a Christian education which helps develop a positive self-image, growth in the ability to make strong moral judgments, and a spirit of respect and generosity toward others.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Our Mission

Therefore, in our school the administration, faculty, and staff will work together to:

- Create a climate of learning in which each individual child can progress and mature spiritually, intellectually, psychologically, and physically, at his or her own rate while integrating faith into their daily life.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Administration Procedures

Admissions

St. Mark School is a Catholic elementary school intended to provide a quality Catholic education to children of families who are registered and active members of St. Mark parish. Non-active members and non-parishioners will be considered for admission if space and financial considerations permit. Applications for St. Mark School will be considered on the basis of the following guidelines.

(Page 7 of Handbook)

SAINT MARY BYZANTINE SCHOOL

Excerpts from St. Mary Byzantine Catholic School
Handbook of School Policies and Guidelines
1999-2000

Philosophy and Goals:

We believe that St. Mary Byzantine Catholic School is an expression of the mission to teach entrusted by Jesus to the Church he founded.

Through education we strive to prepare our students to hear the message of hope contained in the Gospel and to base their love and service of God and others upon this message.

Students are instructed in human knowledge and skills as well as in religious truths and values. Learning and living are integrated in the light of faith as experienced by our Byzantine Catholic traditions in order to permit each student to become a mature and responsible Christian fully utilizing his/her God-given capabilities.

We proclaim the teachings of Christ in order to build a life of faith in each student, to promote a spirit of Christian community in order to strengthen a sense of belonging, and likewise, to lead students to realize the need they have to serve their fellow human beings.

We respect the individuality of each child and accept the responsibility to develop each child's intellectual faculties according to his/her abilities insofar as we are capable of doing so.

In order to respond to and proclaim the Gospel message, our students should:

1. Develop a sense of religious values
2. Grow in personal prayer life
3. Form Christian attitudes
4. Develop a love and appreciation of the practices and spirituality of our Byzantine Catholic Tradition

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Religious Instructions:

In keeping with our intention of developing religious and moral values in accordance with Christian Catholic teachings, every student participates in daily religion classes. Likewise, in order to make our students more aware of their obligation to show concern for others, they are sometimes asked to give their time and efforts in service for others through various works and projects. They are also called upon to worship at Liturgy on feast days and other special occasions. Each student participates in daily prayer within the classroom community. Opportunities to share in penance services and receive the sacrament of reconciliation are provided at intervals throughout the year. All student enrolled in our school must participate in our religious instruction program.

(Page 5 of Handbook)

SAINT MARY COLLINWOOD SCHOOL

SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

We, the faculty and staff at St. Mary School, affirm the dignity and worth of each child. We believe each child is created by God in His Image, is redeemed by Jesus Christ, and is called by Baptism into his family, the Church. We also affirm the role of parents in the formation and education of their children.

With the mission entrusted to us through education, we seek to prepare our students by hearing the message of hope contained in the Gospel, by proclaiming that message to others, and translating that proclamation into action. The educational mission of our school is an integrated mission encompassing these three basic dimensions, and the following specific objectives:

1. To provide excellence in the quality of education; to support a curriculum that is flexible enough to embrace all of life and life's experiences, and to employ a variety of techniques and processes to address the needs of different learning styles.

2. To model as staff members the virtues of justice, peace, and mercy in relationship with one another, so as to help our students live justly, mercifully, and peacefully as individuals; to help implant these virtues for use in adult life.

3. To establish the value of Christian truth and assist the student to approach this truth.

4. To install self-discipline and the ability to make appropriate decisions.

5. To establish and nurture a real relationship with Jesus through sacramental life, prayer, study, and serving others through everyday school life.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

SAINT MEL SCHOOL

Excerpts from Saint Mel School Handbook 1999-2000

St. Mel School Mission Statement

In partnership with our parents, parish and neighboring community, the faculty, staff and priest(s) of St. Mel School, believe that our students can achieve high academic, social and moral standards. Our school exists to educate our students to grow spiritually and intellectually to become committed Christians who will recognize the dignity and worth of every human being. Through our curriculum, we will reflect the faith and knowledge needed to ensure that every student receives the opportunity to achieve. We, the staff and school community of St. Mel are eager to provide our students with a total educational experience which is centered in the principles and values of our Catholic Faith. We will develop young people who will be responsible, caring citizens who will face the future with confidence.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

St. Mel Vision Statement

We, the staff and school community of St. Mel, are eager to provide our students with a total educational experience which is centered in the principles and values of our Catholic Faith. We will develop young people who will be responsible, caring citizens who will face the future with confidence.

(Page 5 of Handbook)

SAINT PATRICK SCHOOL

Excerpts from Family Handbook

Mission Statement

St. Patrick School is a Catholic School in the Diocese of Cleveland, Ohio. The mission of St Patrick School is to live and teach the Gospel message. We are dedicated to the formation of youth according to our Catholic Traditions within an innovative academic environment which provides students with the opportunity to develop spiritually, academically, and socially to the best of their abilities.

Objectives of Education

1. To communicate the gospel message of Jesus.
2. To provide opportunities to build and experience a faith community.
3. To orient students to the responsibility and experience of service because of their membership in the Christian community.
4. To provide students with opportunity for growth in prayer.
5. To provide instruction in religious truths and values in such a way that they become an integrated part of the school program.
6. To develop a faculty and staff who by their presence and teaching express an integrated approach to learning and living in their lives.
7. To provide an academic program and environment conducive to the optimal development of each student.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Curriculum
Religious Education

Religion classes are taught daily. The National Catechetical Directory is the norm. The basic text used is Loyola Press, "Christ is Our Life" series.

Throughout the year there are several opportunities where the entire student body celebrates the Mass and other liturgical celebrations together. Parents are invited to attend these liturgies which are planned by the children.

In addition to attending Mass, the children pray together in their classrooms, and participate in other para-liturgical celebrations such as Eucharistic Devotions, Stations of the Cross, and May Crowning. Children are also given opportunities for the reception of the Sacrament of Reconciliation during Advent and Lent.

Religious education in school is supplemental to the faith witness and example given by the parents at home. All students are required to participate in religion classes and all religious, liturgical, and para-liturgical celebrations.

Preparation for the parents and students of Grade Two occurs for the Sacraments of Reconciliation and Holy Eucharist. Grade Eight students and their parents prepare for the Sacrament of Confirmation. Parent meetings are held in the evening and one parent is required to attend.

(Page 10 of Handbook)

SAINT ROCCO SCHOOL

Excerpts from Saint Rocco School Parent-Student Handbook
1999-2000

Mission Statement

Saint Rocco School is a Faith Community built upon the beliefs of the Catholic Church. We believe that respect for God, others, and self forms a family-like environment. We are committed to quality Catholic education to all elementary students. This mission is based on the Gospel values.

Philosophy

The Faculty of St. Rocco School, believes that "Catholic schools afford the fullest and best opportunity to realize the threefold purpose of a Christian education among children and young people. Thus motivated, we strive to make people's faith become living, conscious, and active through the light of instruction: Thus instruction is offered to all God's children no matter their race, color, creed, or sex. Understanding that not all children have been endowed with the same talents and abilities an atmosphere of openness and understanding will be provided and maintained for those students who have special education needs.

An integral part of the school program is instruction in religious truths and values. These values permeate the whole atmosphere of the school. Building on this foundation, a curriculum is offered which strives to prepare the students to develop intellectually, morally, emotionally and socially. Instruction in human skills and knowledge will hopefully enable students to reflect the gospel values and to discern the significance of God's plan for His creation.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Curriculum

Religious Education Program

All students, whether Catholic or not, participate in religion classes, mass, religious activities and receive a religion grade. Only Catholic students may receive the sacraments. Participation of religious activities during school time may be part of the religion and/or music grade.

(Page 11 of Handbook)

SAINT STANISLAUS SCHOOL

Excerpts from Handbook

Mission Statement

St. Stanislaus School is an integral part of the St. Stanislaus community whose shared mission with parents is to facilitate Christian values within the context of the core curriculum. We commit ourselves to the formation of a faith-filled Catholic community, preparing students for spiritual development, and future roles as responsible, knowledgeable, productive Christian individuals.

Philosophy

St. Stanislaus School strives to create a Community of Faith which is living and active. We aim to provide instruction in the Catholic faith, and opportunities to practice that faith in an atmosphere rooted in Christian values, principles, ideals, and traditions with an emphasis on the dignity of the person.

Through instruction, example, and guidance, the spiritual, academic, psychological, social, cultural, and physical development of each child is fostered in order to provide a quality education for all.

We believe that the school is in partnership with parents in pursuit of our ultimate goal which is the formation of the whole person in order to prepare him/her to meet the challenges of today's world.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS – SAINT PHILLIP SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent/Student Handbook

Mission Statement

As a Catholic School serving in the African-American Community our Mission at St Thomas Aquinas-St. Phillip Neri School is to introduce, develop and reinforce spiritual, moral and Catholic Christian values to educate the mind, body and soul, to develop and lift self-esteem. We promote programs which teach positive multi-cultural awareness. We prepare our students to be among the best and instill in them the importance of striving for excellence.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Mass

There will be a weekly mass for all students. The lower grades will attend mass on Wednesday morning and the upper grades on Friday morning. It is also expected that all students will actively participate in masses.

(Page 12-13 of Handbook)

SAINT VINCENT DE PAUL SCHOOL

Excerpts from St. Vincent de Paul School Parent Handbook
1999-2000

Mission Statement

The faculty, staff, students, and parents of St. Vincent de Paul School are committed to modeling Christian values and principles to bring about Catholic faith formation in each individual student through the development of quality academic, social, cultural, spiritual and aesthetic programs which will be integrated and nurtured in their daily lives. Our hope and purpose is that our students will become compassionate and productive members of a global society.

School Philosophy

At St. Vincent de Paul School we join in the educational ministry of the Church as we teach the Gospel message, build a community of faith and love, and serve the human family through prayer, worship, and social action. The administration, faculty and staff of St. Vincent de Paul School are dedicated to spiritual growth, quality education and academic excellence. They are concerned with the growth and development of the total child. In cooperation with the parents, the teachers strive to integrate religious truths and values with academic knowledge and skills so that students achieve their highest intellectual and moral potential. As members of the school community, students are prepared for responsible Christian living, a respect for self and others and an awareness of the privileges and responsibilities of American and global citizenship.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Religious Educational Sacramental Programs

The Prime purpose for the existence of our school is the teaching of religion and the practical application of the Christian social principles. In a Catholic school, all learning can take place in an atmosphere of religious ideals.

(Page 11 of Handbook)

School Goals

St. Vincent de Paul School strives to develop responsible Christian attitudes which will grow and develop as our students mature and assume their Christian role in society. As partners with the parents in the total education of each child, the faculty and staff strive —

- To assist our students in being open to the message of the Good News in order to experience a loving relationship with the Lord through instruction, prayer, community, worship and service.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

SAINT VITUS SCHOOL
Excerpts from Parent and Student Handbook 1999-2000

Saint Vitus School Mission Statement

St. Vitus School draws its reason for existence from the mission of the Church. It strives to assist parents in developing Catholic men and women who demonstrate their faith by love of God and neighbor and respect for the dignity of each individual.

Respecting the heritage and history of its people, the school integrates religious truths and values with contemporary knowledge and skills. The school exists for the education of Catholic children and for the education of non-Catholic children who hold these same values.

Philosophy and Goals of Saint Vitus School

Saint Vitus School works with parents who are the first educators of their children. The St. Vitus community sees the worth of its school in its potential to develop young Catholic men and women whose spiritual and educational foundation should result in totally committed Christians who demonstrate their faith by love of God and respect for the dignity of each individual.

The school community, through its integrated curriculum, liturgical services, and the good example of priests, parents, faculty and students, strives to develop an atmosphere in which these aims may be reached.

The school integrates religious truths and values with knowledge and skills in order to provide quality education for all students. Guided by eternal truths, the school endeavors to be contemporary in its approach to the problems and challenges of modern life.

In accord with this philosophy, our school community emphasizes the following goals:

KNOWLEDGE OF FAITH
Realize and internalize the primary place of faith in one's life
Grow in the knowledge of the truths of our faith as taught by Christ through His Church
Express our faith through our actions
Participate in community worship and in the sacraments
Seek a relationship with God through prayer

CHARACTER: MORAL RESPONSIBILITY
Develop a commitment to a Catholic philosophy of values intellectually and in life's situations through mutual example and support in living according to Christian values
Be of service to others in the family, school and community

SELF-DISCIPLINE
Develop the self-direction required to follow the actions and attitudes of Jesus Christ
Assume personal responsibility for one's actions
Grow in the self-discipline needed to attain personal and social goals

QUALITY ACADEMIC EDUCATION
Develop knowledge and skills
Stimulate a desire for knowledge and a search for truth

(Page 1-2 of Handbook)

CALVARY CENTER ACADEMY

Calvary Center Academy Parent-Student Handbook 1999-2000

Mission Statement

The mission of Calvary Center Academy is to promote academic excellence in secular and religious studies, and to facilitate both intellectual understanding and practical applications of Apostolic Christian values in the daily lives of our students.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Philosophy

The Governing Board of Education of Calvary Center Academy is composed of members from the Cleveland Apostolic Ministerial Fellowship elected by the Fellowship. The Board takes the following position regarding all academic programs:

1. The pursuit of truth is a basic commitment of the Academy and it will seek to discover, apply and communicate truth.
2. The entire personality develops and grows through Commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ and search for truth.
3. Biblical truth should be at the center and integrated into all curricular and extracurricular experiences of the student.
4. Faith and reason are viewed as complementary. The Academy will pursue the integration of faith and learning in all subjects.

To fulfill these objectives, Calvary Center Academy seeks to provide a learning environment in the Apostolic-Judaic Christian tradition which brings fulfillment of the whole person through the Lord Jesus Christ.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

WESTSIDE BAPTIST CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent-Student Handbook

Statement of Purpose

It shall be the purpose of Westside Baptist Christian School to provide a quality Christian education in an atmosphere where Godly moral values, as taught in the Word of God, are practiced.

W.B.C.S. believes that Christ is the basis of all learning. All subjects will be taught from the Biblical perspective that all truth is God's truth. The educational process is seen as a channel used by the Holy Spirit to bring the student to a personal faith in Jesus Christ and to train the student in godly living. -

The student will be taught Biblical principles so he may understand God's plan for his life spiritually, mentally, emotionally, physically, and socially. We wish each student to realize his fullest God-given potential for God's glory.

It shall be the school's purpose to work in harmony with the home as W.B.C.S. believes that a student's success is dependent upon the home sharing and upholding the same principles as the school. The reinforcement of these principles by Bible preaching churches will provide a solid foundation for life.

(Page 7 of Handbook)

SECOND NEW HOPE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY

Excerpts from Student Handbook

Code of Conduct

A unique characteristic of Second New Hope Christian Academy is that its discipline goals and procedures are rooted in the Scriptural understanding of discipleship. Growth in discipleship is the result of the activity of the Holy Spirit working through God's word.

(Page 1 of Handbook)

Chapel/Daily Devotions

A children's chapel service is held every Monday and parents are welcome to attend. Chapel services should not be thought of as taking the place of Sunday Worship Services but only as supplemental to those.

Each classroom begins and ends the school day with devotions led either by the teacher, individual students or small groups.

(Page 3 of Handbook)

Student Pledge

The student pledge describes ten rules that form the basis behavior standards at Second New Hope Christian Academy.

AS A STUDENT OF SECOND NEW HOPE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY, I WILL:

- Show love and respect for the Lord

(Page 5 of the Handbook)

LUTHER MEMORIAL SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent Handbook

Our Mission

Luther Memorial School provides a quality, Christ-centered education in a structured environment that nurtures and challenges students to achieve their God-given potential in partnership with home and church.

-(Cover Page of Handbook)

The School Motto

"EVERY DAY WITH GOD'S WORD" is the motto of Luther Memorial School. Only by that means can a child be led to love God, be received into the Kingdom of Christ our Savior, learn to honor his fellow man, live a God-pleasing life, and gain eternal happiness.

Prayer for our School

Lord, God, Heavenly Father, who has blessed us much more than we deserve with a fine school, faculty, staff, and student body, make us truly grateful for this blessing, and grant Thy Holy Spirit to teachers, students, and parents that this coming school year may prove a real blessing to us all. Give the teachers wisdom to teach the children that Jesus Christ is their Savior and loves them, and help us all be strengthened in our faith and to love Him in return who has said "Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God." Trusting that we will heed this request in the best possible way by operating this, our school we ask your divine blessing upon our efforts and your

protection upon all for the sake of our Savior, Jesus Christ. AMEN.

(Page 22 of Handbook)

SAINT JOHN NOTTINGHAM LUTHERAN SCHOOL

Excerpts from Parent Handbook 1999-2000

Our Philosophy of Education

It is our belief that the one cardinal objective
of education to which all others point
is to develop devotion to God as our Creator,
Redeemer, and Sanctifier, whose love for us
moves us to show in our every act, thought,
word and desire, our love for Him.

"THE FEAR OF THE LORD IS THE BEGINNING OF KNOWLEDGE."

Proverbs 1:7

To bring about such development, it is our constant aim to provide in each and every pupil his or her – FAITH-GOOD WORK-PERSONAL LIFE ADJUSTMENT, which includes training for maximum physical, intellectual, and emotional capabilities of each child, with all due recognition for individual difference through various development stages of growth.

This basic philosophy determines the curriculum, content of the course of study, and the environment making up the total teaching-learning situation at St. John.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

<u>What is Education in a Christian School</u>?

In education, we are concerned with the development of knowledge, ability, skill, attitude and character by means of teaching, training, study and experience. Christian education

has precisely the same general aims, but it is based on the Bible and has three specific goals:

1. To lead the individual to faith in Christ and to keep him in that faith.
2. To help the individual to develop into an even better and more perfect Christian in all of life's relationships, both secular and religious.
3. To keep before the individual the goal of every child of God - Eternal Life.

The Lutheran Day School is the best agency for such Christian education because it provides for the total growth and development of the child. The Bible describes such a complete education in Luke 2:52: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man."

(Page 3 of Handbook)

Objectives of a Christian Education

In the development of his SPIRITUAL potentialities, Christian education guides the child to:

1. Acquire a thorough knowledge of God and His Word.
2. Recognize his sin and the need for salvation.
3. Accept Jesus as his Savior through the working of the Holy Spirit.
4. Rely upon God for both temporal and spiritual blessings.
5. Desire to live according to God's law.
6. Utilize the means of grace, namely, the Word and Sacraments.
7. Lead a sanctified life.
8. Desire to lead others to the Savior.
9. Serve the church through the proper stewardship of time, talents, and treasures.

(Page 3 of Handbook)

SAINT MARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL

Excerpts from St. Mark Lutheran School 1999-2000 Parent-Student Handbook

Current Mission Statement

It is our mission of St. Mark Lutheran School to provide the quality of Christian education that keeps the Light of Christ first and foremost.

Welcome to St. Mark Lutheran School

The primary focus of St. Mark Lutheran School is on our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. In all of our goals, Jesus Christ must be preeminent. Because of our commitment to that focus and to our beliefs and philosophy, it is highly inconsistent for any parents to send a child to this school if they:

- Are not a Christian and/or not interested in learning about Jesus Christ
- Are not living a Christian life or willing to learn how to lead such a life
- Are not a supporting part of a Christian congregation through worship and sharing of time and talents

(Page 2 of Handbook)

Religious Instruction

All students, regardless of their religious background, are expected to participate in daily religion class and to be instructed in the basic teachings of God's Word through an organized program of Christian education. The process of

religious instruction is directed toward the goal of a stronger, more mature faith in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

St. Mark Lutheran School begins each school day with a classroom devotion and prayer. The school day is also ended with classroom prayer. As appropriate for each grade, students are provided with time for personal reading of the Word of God and for prayer to strengthen their personal relationship with God.

(Page 28 of Handbook)

WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOLS OF BETHANY, HOLY CROSS AND PURITAS

Excerpts from Parent Handbook 1999-2000

Purpose of West Park Lutheran School

West Park Lutheran School's main objectives are:
1) the leading of its children to know Christ as their Lord and Savior; and
2) To foster academic excellence

Specifically, our aims are the following:
I. To provide thorough instruction In God's Word in order that:
A. Pupils may learn to trust In Jesus Christ as their living Savior and the only way to heaven.
B. Pupils may know what the Lord expects of them as children of God.
C. Pupils may willingly do that which is right and God-pleasing and avoid that which is evil.

II. To cooperate with the Christian home and the children that they might be a credit to their parents, an asset to the church and worthy citizens of the community

III. To provide thorough instructions in all the required elementary and junior high school subjects so that knowledge, when taught in harmony with the Holy Scriptures, may help boys and girls to live successfully and in accord with the Word and will of God.

(Page 4 of Handbook)

Curriculum

Since our philosophy and purpose are to provide a sound religious education, it is natural that children attending our school receive regular courses in religious instruction in addition to that provided in church and at home. Some of the primary subjects in the religion courses are Bible history, catechism, memorization and Bible reading. We consider these as the foundation upon which the Lutheran school curriculum as a whole is built.

(Page 8 of Handbook)

RAMAH JUNIOR ACADEMY

Statement of Mission

Ramah Junior Academy is an organizational unit of the world-wide Seventh-Day Adventist educational system.

Its mission is:

(1) To provide quality Christian education consistent with Seventh-day Adventist standards, and meeting the State Minimum Standards Act, as well as the current needs of our times.

(2) To motivate students to commit their lives to God in preparation for active service in the home, school, church, and community; and for higher service in the world to come.

(Mission Statement)

CLEVELAND COMMUNITY ISLAMIC SCHOOL

Excerpts from Cleveland Community Islamic School Handbook 1999/2000

Mission Statement

Bismillah (In the Name of Allah)
Our mission at the Cleveland Community Islamic School (C.C.I.S.) is the mission of discharging our sacred duty to humanity. The sacred duty prescribed to us by Allah (The Almighty God). The sacred and incumbent duty of providing meaningful and useful knowledge to all. In line with our Islamic beliefs, knowledge and its applications are not a privilege, a pastime or a hobby, rather it is incumbent and a must upon every male and female. Furthermore, it is the absolute fundamental right of every child to be well grounded with the best knowledge and training there is.

Subhana Allan (Glory be to Allah)
In keeping with these, it is the goal of C.C.I.S. to provide knowledge and training in moral and academic excellence to each student in the school. This knowledge and training by the grace of Allah, will be planned in a conducive Islamic environment to fully equip each student with the wisdom and the understanding that will enable him or her to skillfully, efficiently and successfully face the challenges of this life and to have a very strong hope of success for the eternal life.

Insha Allah (God Willing)
It's also the hope of C.C.I.S. that this knowledge and training by the power the authority and the will of Allah, will give the student the upper hand to be: (1) a believer (a logical and a rational thinker, and morally and ethically conscious person); (2) an executor of good deeds (such as a peacemaker, a tolerator, an organizer, a leader, a follower, a trainer, a

respector, a contributor, an appreciator, a grateful and thankful person, a caretaker, a responsible and an honest person, a compassionate and loving person, a visionary, a pioneer, an inventor, a producer, a designer, a builder, an establisher of a civilization and a middle nation that is just and fair to all); (3) a leader and an adviser in the truthfulness; and (4) above all, a very patient, decent, righteous, God-fearing person.

(Page 2 of Handbook)

DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND
OFFICE OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Excerpts from Kindergarten Guide 1999

Diocese of Cleveland Philosophy of Catholic Education
Sources

WE BELIEVE that a philosophy of Catholic education begins with faith that God, in creating, gifted us with life, became one of us in His Son Jesus, and in the person of His Spirit awaits our response to His unconditional overture of love. Jesus remains with the community He formed, witnessing and sharing the Good News in every age and with all people, ever yearning for a return of love either by a sincere response to conscience or by membership in His Church. It is from this perspective that the educational ministry of the Catholic community flows.

Catholic Education

WE BELIEVE that education which is Catholic begins, with life, in the heart of the family. Parents, the primary educators, seed nourish values deeply human, deeply spiritual. Affirmed, treasured, and supported by the loving witness of Christian faith communities, the child continues a life-long response to God's love in growing and excelling through responsible involvement in the academic, cultural, and civic concerns of daily life.

Catholic Schools

WE BELIEVE that the Catholic school is sensitive to the mandate of Jesus: "Love one another as I have loved you" as the goal toward all Catholic education tends. The school community, in sharing this vision within an atmosphere designed to celebrate and practice love of God and neighbor, is the most effective means available to the Church for the education of youth. This vision motivates students to grow

academically, culturally, and socially. Among the values prized in the Catholic school are self-worth, self-discipline, in the search for a moral way of life. and appreciation for our American heritage. With deep concern for their brothers and sisters, young people in our Catholic schools form their personal response to truth, justice and love to God their Maker.

(Page iv of Guide)

Goals for Catholic Schools in the Diocese of Cleveland

1. To communicate the Gospel message of Jesus.
2. To provide opportunities to build and experience a faith community.
3. To orient students to the responsibility and experience of service because of their membership in the Christian community.
4. To provide students with the opportunity for growth in prayer.
5. To provide instruction in religious truths and values in such a way that they become an integrated part of the school program.
6. To develop a faculty and staff who by their presence and teaching express an integrated approach to learning and living in their lives.
7. To provide an academic program and environment conducive to the optimal development of each student.

(Page v of Guide)

DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND
OFFICE OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Excerpts from Handbook for Elementary Schools 1997

Mission Statement of the Office of Catholic Education

We are a Faith Community in Formation.
We are committed to the educational mission of the Catholic Church
in the elementary and secondary schools.
Therefore, our mission is to lead, assist, and support
Catholic schools in providing quality education
infused with Gospel values.
(Page 3 of Handbook)

District Plan for Catholic Schools August 1998

Goal I
Our CATHOLIC IDENTITY will permeate every aspect of the school climate and program and will guide staff selection and professional development.

A. Administration and faculty will engage in study and reflection on the core documents and core values of the Catholic faith.
B. Appropriate certification as catechists and catechetical leaders will be maintained by teachers and administrators according to the guidelines of the diocesan Religious Education Office.
C. Schools will show tangible evidence of being Catholic through their expression of community, message, service and worship.
D. Eucharist will be revered as the center of our lives, and thus liturgy will receive appropriate attention in its preparation and celebration.

E. School communities will strive to form a faith community with its foundation in the parish and the diocese.

F. The school administration will ensure that a Catholic philosophy of education permeates instruction by providing faith formation opportunities for faculty; engaging with staff in regular review of the curriculum; and performing regularly scheduled class visitation.

G. The religious heritage strand in each subject area curriculum will receive appropriate emphasis to ensure that Catholic values and social justice principles are essential elements in student learning.

H. The school administration will review hiring practices and orientation programs to ensure that religion is taught by practicing Catholics.

I. Parents and families will receive support from the school as integral members of the school's community of faith for the enrichment of their faith lives.

(Page 7 of Handbook)

I-3

Blesssed Sacrament School

Materials

SCHOOL HOURS

8:20	FIRST BELL
8:30	SECOND BELL
11:45-12:30	LUNCH (See LUNCH SCHEDULE)
2:45	REGULAR DISMISSAL

DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND
PHILOSOPHY OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

WE BELIEVE that a philosophy of Catholic education begins with faith that God, in creating, gifted us with life, became one of us in His Son Jesus, and in the person of His Spirit awaits our response to His unconditional overture of love. Jesus remains with every age and with all people, ever yearning for a return of love either by a sincere response to conscience or by membership in His Church. It is from this perspective that the educational ministry of the Catholic community flows.

WE BELIEVE that education which is Catholic begins with life, in the heart of the family. Parents, the primary educators, seed and nourish values deeply human, deeply spiritual. Affirmed, treasured, and supported by the loving witness of Christian faith communities, the child continues a life-long response to God's love in growing and excelling through responsible involvement in the academic, cultural, and civic concerns of daily life.

WE BELIEVE that the Catholic school is sensitive to the mandate of Jesus: "love one another as I have loved you" as the goal toward which all Catholic education tends. The school community, in sharing this vision within an atmosphere designed to celebrate and practice love of God and neighbor, is the most effective means available to the Church for the education of youth. This vision motivates

students to grow academically, culturally, and socially. Among the values prized in the Catholic school are self-worth, self-discipline in the search for a moral way of life, and appreciation for our American heritage. With deep concern for their brothers and sisters, young people in our Catholic schools form their personal response to truth, justice and love of God, their Maker.

BLESSED SACRAMENT SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

Blessed Sacrament School aims to educate each child spiritually, culturally, socially and intellectually by providing a religious and academic climate in which to grow and learn. The school attempts to gear its programs to the development of the highest intellectual and moral potential of the child in order to meet the immediate goal of eternal salvation. It aims to teach self discipline, which encourages creative thinking and intellectual activity. Blessed Sacrament School strives to develop Catholic values within each child. As a member of the school community, students are prepared for responsible Christian living with contributions to make and responsibilities to share with being of service to others. The school endeavors to instill in each student a respect for self and others, as well as an awareness of the privileges and responsibilities of American Citizenship.

STATEMENT OF GOALS

We, the faculty and staff of Blessed Sacrament School, feel that our enthusiasm, interest and sincere efforts help to inspire each child in our classes to bring about a real community of faith through participation in the sacramental and liturgical life of the Church.

It is our hope to develop the hearts and minds of our students so as to prepare them spiritually, intellectually and morally. The following list of goals supports these values:

1. To provide an educational program that meets the need of each student and to evaluate the program according to criteria established for competency.

2. To encourage students to recognize and reach their full intellectual potential through the utilization of educational technology and media.

3. To teach responsibility for the rights and needs of others.

4. To encourage each student to form Christian values and morals and to follow these teachings through Christlike examples.

5. To encourage the concept of self-discipline in each student in order to provide the ability to better control his/her life and destiny as adults.

6. To show, by example, the Christian virtues of reverence, devotion and prayerfulness.

MISSION POLICY

MISSION STATEMENT FOR BLESSED SACRAMENT SCHOOL

Be it known to all who enter here that Christ is the reason for this school. The unseen, but ever present, teacher in its classes, the model of its faculty, the inspiration of its students.

All who leave here will use their lessons of love, peace, and understanding to reach their individual academic potential and become responsible citizens within their community.

RELIGIOUS PROGRAM

In keeping with the philosophy of our school, the truths of Catholicism are presented daily in many and varied ways:

- Formal religion classes are held daily.
- Children plan and participate in worship services.
- Prayer is said daily in the classroom.
- Mission projects and contributions designed to help those less fortunate (both in our country and foreign nations) are encouraged.
- Where appropriate and relevant, the academic program reference is made to Christian teaching.
- Motivation for proper conduct and interpersonal relationships finds its reference in the example of Christ.

- The discipline code is rooted in a respect for the rights of each individual as a unique and special child of God.

Christianity cannot be lived only five days a week! We are only partners with you, the parents, in all educational endeavors, including the spiritual development of your children. You are urged to be an example for your children in Christian living and be active members of your religious community.

HOLY REDEEMER SCHOOL
MISSION STATEMENT

CELEBRATING GOD'S BLESSING

Holy Redeemer Parish School is...

...a Catholic School

...committed to
sharing the Good News
with all people

...while instilling
a sense of knowledge
and love of the Catholic faith
and traditions.

Together
we strive for
excellence in education.

HOLY REDEEMER SCHOOL

Parent-Student Handbook

15720 Kipling Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44110
(216) 486-0935

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mission Statement 1
Goals and Objectives 1
School Personnel 2
Parent Responsibilities 2
Parent Groups 2
Administration Procedures 3
Admissions 3
Admission Policy 3
School Hours 3
Attendance 3
Tardiness 4
Reporting Absence 4
Appointments 4
Emergency Closing 4
Office House 4
Family/Custodial Situations Relations with the School 5
Finances – Tuition and Fees 7
Curriculum 8
Religious Education Program 8
Instructional Program 8
Homework 8
Student Evaluations 8
Report Cards 9
Parent Conferences 9
Progress Reports 9
Testing Program 9
Field Trips 9
After School Program 9
School Policies and Procedures 10
Student Behavior Code 10
Suspension 11
Situations with Specific Consequences 12
Gum Chewing 12
Materials Brought to School 12

Lunch Program 12
Birthday Treats 12
Pregnancy Policy 14
Diocesan Policy Regarding Possession, Sale
Use or Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol 15
Youth Gangs 15
Weapons Policy 17
Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy 18
Dress Code 20
Gym Uniforms 22
Dress Down 22
Cold Weather Clothing 22
Care of Books and Property 22
Health and Accident Procedures 22
Health Services 22
Contagious Diseases 23
Medication 23
Transportation and Safety 24
School Yard 24
Parent Drivers or Drivers 24

Parent's Request for Administration or Medication by School

Physician's Request for the Administration
of Medication by School Personnel

MISSION STATEMENT

Holy Redeemer Parish School is a Catholic School committed to sharing the good news with all people while instilling a sense of knowledge and love of the Catholic faith and traditions. Together we strive for excellence in education.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Holy Redeemer Catholic School educates students to strengthen and develop personal love for Christ by...

- Growing in a meaningful prayer life and understanding of Catholic beliefs, worship and moral teaching
- Forming a Christian conscience and developing decision-making skills based on Gospel values
- Developing positive attitudes of concern and respect for others
- Becoming involved in opportunities for Christian Service

Develop a wholesome self-image by...

- Recognizing, developing and respecting the God-given talents in oneself and others
- Developing self-discipline and assuming personal responsibility for one's attitudes and behavior
- Developing leadership skills

Assume personal responsibility for learning by...

- Developing those study skills which promote life-long learning
- Developing and applying critical thinking and problem solving skills in all areas of the curriculum

- Acquiring proficiency and clarity in oral and written communication
- Exploring basic concepts of science and social science
- Achieving math competency and computer literacy
- Increasing awareness and appreciation of our multicultural heritage
- Experiencing and appreciating aesthetic value in art, music, and literature
- Developing habits of healthful living and skills for physical fitness, sportsmanship and recreation
- Becoming aware of career options and leisure pursuits and seeking guidance in the application of one's talents

SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Together our staff seeks to provide a total school program for the students. Every teacher and staff member is fully qualified, state certified and dedicated to Catholic Education. Through Federal and State funding, we have assisting personnel who provide services such as speech therapy, nursing, psychology and tutoring. Volunteers also work within the school to provide assistance by being teacher aides or assist in supervision.

PARENT RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary responsibility for the education of the children belongs to parents. However, this responsibility is shared with the school as a matter of practical necessity. The greatest single factor in building a child's intellectual, cultural, and moral and spiritual attitude is the example you provide in your home. Parents are responsible for:

- Supporting school policy and the authority of the administration and teachers.
- Modeling and supporting your children's practice of the Catholic Faith if you are Catholic or of the Christian faith of the denomination of your choice.
- Encouraging your child to complete all assignments
- Insisting that your children obey the regulations and principles of good behavior
- Following the policies and procedures stated in the handbook
- Paying all fees on time
- Reimbursing any property destroyed if this is necessary

PARENT GROUPS

Women's Guild

All women of the parish and school families are encouraged to join the Women's Guild and attend monthly meetings.

I-10

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL SCHOOL MATERIALS

MISSION STATEMENT

Our Lady of Good Counsel Catholic School,
serving the community of Old Brooklyn for over 100 years,
as an integral part of Our Lady of Good Counsel Parish,
promotes the total education of our children.
The School, Family and Parish Communities work together
to guide children to grow in the Catholic Faith
develop academic skills and improve social well-being.

379a

1996-1997
STUDENT – FAMILY HANDBOOK

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL SCHOOL
1894-1994

"ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abuse	31	Medical Appointments	8
Admission Policy	3	Medication	29
AIDS Policy	37	Mission Statements	2
Attendance	4	Philosophy	3
Auxiliary Services	18	Pregnancy Policy	35
Awards	15	Promotion	17
B.A.S.E.	19	Registration	5
Behavior Code	19	Religious Education	12
Car Riders	31	Report Cards	15
Conferences	16	Retention	17
Curriculum	14	Sacraments	13
Discipline	19	Safety	29
Domestic Relations	6	Searches	31
Dress Code	25	Service Hours	10
Drills	30	Sexual Harassment	32
Emergency Closing	8	Tardiness	7
Field Trips	19	Testing	16
Gangs	33	Transfer	5
Grading Scale	15	Tuition	9 & 11
Health Policies	28	Uniforms	25
Homework	16	Vacations	8
Immunization	28	Visitors	30
Injuries	31	Walkers	30
Legal Issues	31	Weapons Policy	34
Lunch Program	27	Withdrawls	5

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL PARISH

MISSION STATEMENT

Our Lady of Good Counsel Parish of Old Brooklyn, established in 1873, is a Roman Catholic Faith Community of the Diocese of Cleveland. We are a people with diverse cultures, needs and gifts, who come together as part of the Body of Christ to live and share the Gospel message of Jesus. We value family life, and our participation together in worship, education and spiritual growth, service to human needs and social life.

We seek to:

- Become a more welcoming and caring community, communicating new ideas integrated with traditional values.
- Promote harmony, reconciliation and healing among our members.
- Form a more enthusiastic faith-filled community.
- Establish responsible stewardship of our time, talents and resources.
- Build the kingdom of God while on our mutual spiritual journey to eternal life with Jesus.

In the security of God's unconditional love and empowered by the Resurrection, we will achieve these goals through wisdom of the Gospel and with the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL SCHOOL

MISSION STATEMENT

Our Lady of Good Counsel School is an integral part of the Community of Our Lady of Good Counsel Parish. Our mission is to promote the total education of our children; helping them to the best of their abilities to develop their basic skills, improve their social well-being, and grow in their faith. Through the cooperation of the school, the family and the parish community, we will guide our children to become knowledgeable, productive, faith-filled Christians.

OUR LADY OF GOOD COUNSEL SCHOOL

PHILOSOPHY

Our Lady of Good Counsel School is a Roman Catholic School in the tradition of the Missionaries of the Precious Blood. It shares the mission of the Church to reveal Christ to the world through evangelizing, participating, caring and celebrating the Gospel of Jesus.

Recognizing that each student is a unique individual, made in God's image, and worthy of respect; we strive to create an environment that is conducive to the spiritual, moral, intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development of each student committed to our care.

As an educational community, we strive to present a challenging curriculum that will help the students reach their full potential as Christian individuals and prepare them for living in the parish and other communities.

Our Lady of Good Counsel School believes that the students are the center of its educational mission. This belief calls forth from the students the following responses:

1. a willingness to develop a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.
2. an active participation in the learning process so as to develop his/her own talents.
3. a growing acceptance of and sense of care and concern for others.
4. a developing sense of responsibility within various communities: family, school, parish, city, nation, Church and world.
5. an openness to live the gospel values.

Our Lady of Good Counsel School believes that the educator is a person of faith, committed to the task of guiding the students. The educator's commitment includes:

1. seeking personal growth in faith and a relationship with Jesus Christ.
2. serving as a model of moral living and of the integration of life, learning and faith.
3. stimulating, guiding and facilitating the student's learning.
4. expressing care and concern for each other and for the students.
5. dedicating himself/herself to professional growth and commitment to the mission of the Gospel values.

ADMISSION POLICY

STATEMENT OF NON-DISCRIMINATION:

Our Lady of Good Counsel School admits students of any race, color, national or ethnic origin to all the rights, privileges, programs and activities generally accorded or made available to students. We do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national or ethnic origin in administration of our educational and admission policies. Furthermore, it is the policy of Our Lady of Good Counsel School not to discriminate on the basis of sex in its educational programs or employment as required by Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972.

ENTRY LEVEL:

Our Lady of Good Counsel School was founded and is maintained by parishioners for sharing the Catholic faith and traditions with our Catholic Children. The usual entry grade is Kindergarten. Students will be accepted in Grades 1 through 6 if class size permits. It is the policy not to accept students in Grades 7 and 8 unless they are transfers from another Catholic school and the family has moved into the parish and registers as parishioners. Class size is limited to 25 students in Kindergarten and 30 students in Grades 1 through 8.

Admission to O.L.G.C. school is made through formal registration. Students are accepted only if there is room. When class size reaches the limit, student names are put on a waiting list. Parishioners will be placed on a waiting list ahead of non-parishioners. Under no circumstances will a child be admitted to O.L.G.C. school if it seems that the motive is to avoid racial integration in the public schools. All students admitted to Our Lady of Good Counsel School

are considered to be conditional for the first semester. It is during this time period that a determination will be made as to whether the needs of the child can be met by the school.

ADMISSION OF PARISHIONER:

A parishioner is understood to be one who is registered, attends and contributes to the parish. All Catholic students who live within the boundaries of O.L.G.C. Parish are eligible for admission to the school provided that:

1. The family is registered in O.L.G.C. Parish
2. The parents/guardians understand that they have an obligation to foster a Catholic atmosphere in the home and set a good example as Catholics by regular participation at Mass on Sundays and Holydays and by regular reception of the Sacraments.
3. In addition to the current tuition payments, parents and guardians are expected to contribute weekly to the support of the parish according to their means. The weekly envelope will also be an indication of the family's Mass attendance.
4. The parents/guardians agree to uphold and follow to the best of their ability the policies of the school as stated in the school handbook and other communications and bulletins.
5. The parents/guardians take part in the Service Hour program.

ADMISSIONS OF NON-PARISHIONER:

Any student whose family lives outside the Parish boundaries is considered to be a non-parishioner. Any student whose family lives within the boundaries of the parish, but chooses not to follow the Parishioner guidelines is also considered a non-parishioner. Non-parishioners pay a higher tuition rate and are also expected to support the educational programs of the school through financial support and attendance at meetings.

I – 11

Our Lady of Mount Carmel School
Materials

Our Lady of Mount Carmel
Parish School

Parent-Student
Handbook

1999-2000

1355 W. 70th Street
Cleveland, OH 44102-3093
Telephone: (216) 281-7146
Fax: (216) 281-5561 E-mail:

Table of Contents

MISSION STATEMENT 5

PASTOR'S WELCOME 6

PRINCIPAL'S WELCOME 7

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES 8

GENERAL INFORMATION: 9
..... Hours of Operation
..... Emergency School Closings
..... Telephone Usage

ADMISSION POLICIES: 10
..... Admission
..... Re-registration
..... Transferred Students
..... Proof of Child Custody
..... Withdrawal Policy

ATTENDANCE: 11
..... Arrival & Dismissal Procedure
..... Early Dismissal
..... Absences
..... Tardiness

CURRICULUM: 14
..... Religious Education
..... Sacramental Program
..... Homework Policy
..... Field Trip Policy
..... Books

DRESS CODE:.....15
..... Early Childhood Uniform
.....Girl's Uniform
..... Boy's Uniform
.....Gym Uniform
..... Dress-up Days

TUITION and FEES and PARENT LIABILITY:.....18
..... Registration & Program Fees
..... Fund-raisers & Credits

MISSION STATEMENT
OF
OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL PARISH SCHOOL

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School is a community dedicated to the Christian and academic development of the child. In the light and spirit of Christ the Redeemer, we promote the Christian family life according to the Roman Catholic and Mercedarian Tradition.

Our School emphasizes high expectations for spiritual and academic excellence as well as the social and physical well-being of each child. Catholic morals and ethical values are paramount in their holistic development.

Our Lady of Mount Cannel Parish School believes that the Redeeming presence of Christ in the Eucharist is the center and reflection of our lives. Our mission as Catholic educators is to guide our students to live their lives according to the example of Mary, our Mother of Mercy, and her son, Jesus Christ. We strive to ensure that this mission transcends the classroom and is reflected in our lifestyles.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School recognizes that differences exist in each child in the areas of spiritual development, motivation, aptitude, and achievement. Therefore, we commit ourselves to developing programs, learning theories and instructional strategies that will be effectively utilized to maximize learning time. It is our goal to develop leaders who will contribute their talents to the Church, the community, the country, and the family of nations.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel School
1355 West 70th Street ♦ Cleveland, Ohio 44102-3093

August 1999

Dear Parents and Students,

Welcome and welcome back! We, the faculty, parents, and administration have prepared this handbook in an attempt to draw us all together in a common understanding of our mission here at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School.

You will find that the rules and regulations written in this handbook are established to create the best possible atmosphere for everyone. Having chosen Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School as the primary educational entity for the formation of your child/children implies your support to our educational programs, cooperation with the administration and teachers, and involvement in the parish and school activities. The best way for our students to live the guidelines here is for everyone of us to model them in our lives. Whether it is dropping off children at the right place or checking to make sure uniforms are worn correctly, parents and guardians shape the students adherence to our expectations by giving good example.

If at any time you have any questions, suggestions or concerns, meet with your child's teacher or with me. We will be glad to listen to you or to find answers to your questions. God bless you always, and have a great year!

Yours in Christ and Our Lady of Mercy,

Sister M. Rosano Vega-R, HMSS
Principal

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The cooperation of the parents/guardians represents one of the major factors in the success of the students, the teachers, and the school. By choosing Our Lady of Mount Carmel School to be your partners in education, you become an integral part of our ministry and spirituality. More specifically, a positive and supportive attitude on the part of the parents/guardians toward the policies, instructional programs, faculty, staff, and administrators is necessary for the accomplishments of all objectives. The role that you play in the school as a parent/guardian is crucial in following and supporting the policies and programs of our school.

Parents are responsible for:

- Modeling and supporting your child's practice of the faith by being an active member of the faith community and bringing your son/daughter to Mass on Sunday on a regular basis.

- Supporting school policies and the authority of the administration and teachers.

- Encouraging your son/daughter to complete all assignments on time and monitoring their progress.

- Insisting that your son/daughter obeys the regulations and principles of good behavior.

- Making sure your son/daughter arrives at school on time and avoid unnecessary absences.

- Discussing problems with the person(s) concerned and avoiding criticism of teachers and school policy.

- Paying all fees (tuition, lunch, milk, etc.) on time.

Parental/guardian cooperation is essential for the welfare of the students. *If, in the opinion of the administration, parent/guardian behavior seriously interferes with the teaching/learning process, mission or philosophy of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School, the school will not tolerate such infringement and will exercise the right to dismiss the family from the school.*

ADMISSION AND ENROLLMENT POLICIES

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, social level or ethnic origin in the administration of its admission policies, scholarship policies, or other programs.

In order to enter the early childhood program, a child must be three years of age by September 30th for admission in the three year-old class. In order to enter Pre-Kindergarten, a child must be four years of age by September 30th. Correspondingly, a child must be five years of age by September 30th in order to enter Kindergarten.

Admission is made through formal registration. At that time, the following materials are required:

- A completed OLMC Parish School Registration Form.
- Non-refundable registration fee.
- Birth Certificate.
- Baptismal Certificate/sacramental information
- Current Immunization Record.
- Report Card (Transfer students).
- Custody Information if applicable.

- Parent or guardian signature on *Agreement of School Policies Form* before admission is accepted.

Prior to the first day of school the following forms must be submitted:

- Physical Examination Record (New students).
- Emergency Medical Authorization Form.
- Emergency Transportation Authorization Form.
- Authorized Pick-up List (Early childhood & after care students).
- Federal Lunch Program Form.

PLEASE NOTE: If there are any changes in information, it is the parent's/guardian's responsibility to notify the school office immediately IN WRITING. It is extremely important that this information is accurate in case of illness, medical emergency or accident.

RE-REGISTRATION

Before the end of the school year, every family is to re-register for the following year. The administration reserves the right in some cases not to invite or accept re-registration. This includes but is not limited to, instances of extreme, persistent, or unresolved discipline problems, and/or inability of the school to provide for the special educational needs of the student. If philosophy and/or policies are not observed, or if tuition is outstanding or financial obligations have not been cleared.

Elementary and Junior High students who arrive before 8:20 a.m. will be instructed to report to the Extended Day Care, located on the campus. Remember that school begins at 8:30. There is no supervision before school. Students should report to their class lines no earlier than 8:20 a.m.

For the safety of all, cars are to enter down the hill by the Rectory on Detroit Avenue to drop off students in the morning. Cars are to drive up to the front of the Convent for unloading and exit via West 70th Street.
No students are to be dropped off in front of the school on West 70th Street.

Ball playing is not permitted before school or at dismissal because of the number of students and cars present at these times. Tough play, pushing, swinging book bags, throwing snowballs, and other potentially dangerous activities are never permitted.

Dismissal Procedure

First bell: Grades five through eight are dismissed.
Second bell: Grades kindergarten through four are dismissed.

At dismissal, *cars are to enter from Detroit down the hill* to the school parking lot. Parents/guardians must park along the perimeter of the parking lot when waiting in the parking lot to pick up their child. It is the driver's responsibility to prevent students from darting out from behind stopped cars. Drivers should also be conscious of the flow of traffic behind their cars. After the students are safely in the cars you may drive to exit through West 70th street. PLEASE DO NOT EXIT UP THE HILL TO DETROIT AVENUE DUE TO POOR VISIBILITY.

Any student that needs to cross the parking lot must wait for a faculty member or a cross guard to cross them in front of the seventh grade room.

Students are not allowed to ride bikes or drive to or from the school.

Absences

In the interest of safety, when a student is to be absent from school, parents/guardians must call the school office before 9:00 a.m. When the student returns to school, the parents/guardians must submit a signed, written excuse to the homeroom teacher explaining the reason for the absence. A student who has been absent three or more consecutive days must submit a doctor's excuse before he/she will be allowed to return to school. A student who has been absent for five or more days per quarter without a doctor's excuse will not be permitted to participate in any athletic or extracurricular activity leaving this open to the discretion of the principal.

Education Office and is licensed by the Division of Early Childhood Education of the Ohio Department of Education.

The OLMC Kindergarten through Eighth grades follow the Graded Course of Study prepared by the Curriculum Department of the Cleveland Diocesan Education Office. This course of study has the approval of the Ohio Department of Education. The basic curriculum includes but is not limited to Religion, English/Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies, Math, Science/Health, Physical Education, Music, Art, Foreign Language, and Computers.

Religious Education

Roman Catholic Doctrine is an essential part of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School. Catholic Doctrine is presented as a living experience of knowledge and belief rather than just another subject. Students enjoy the opportunity to participate in weekly school Masses, Eucharistic Devotions, and the Sacrament of Penance as part of their religious education. This is in support of the parents'/guardians'

privilege and responsibility of sharing the Faith. Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School requires family participation at special Liturgical Events celebrated throughout the school year. Attendance is part of the student's integral spiritual education. A special Family/School Mass is celebrated every First Sunday of the month at 11:30 a.m. Roman Catholics are expected to take active participation, while Non-Catholics participate by their very presence.

Sacramental Program

Preparation for the reception of the sacraments of Confirmation, Eucharist, and Penance require the *parents' participation in an Adult Program of Roman Catholic Doctrine as set by the Cleveland Diocesan Education Office.*

Homework Policy

Homework is assigned to develop initiative, responsibility, and self-direction in the student. There is no minimum or maximum length of time per evening, as each student is different. Homework may not always take the form of written assignments. *Parents should assist by providing quiet time and a place conducive to study, by checking for neatness and accuracy and by listening to oral recitation.* Parents should not do their child's homework.

If a student fails to complete or submit homework without a valid excuse, the student will not receive any credit. However the work will need to be done twice, and the student may be detained after school to finish the work. If a student ...

ST. AGATHA ST. ALOYSIUS SCHOOL

PARENT STUDENT HANDBOOK

PRINCIPAL'S LETTER

Dear Parents & Students.

St. Agatha-St. Aloysius School invites you to join with us in accomplishing our goal of educating and developing the whole child – spiritually, mentally, morally, physically and socially. No results will be lasting unless the school and home work together in a spirit of trust, understanding, harmony and support, stressing the same essentials in the training of the child.

The primary purpose of every school is to assist the parents in educating their children. The school, however, cannot hope to accomplish its desired end without the full co-operation of the parents. It is during the time spent in his/her home that the child learns his/her first basic lessons of respect, obedience, truthfulness and self-control. If the child has been taught that obedience to his/her parents is important because they are visible representatives of God in the family, then he/she can easily understand why it is important to be obedient to the teachers in the classroom. In short, the foundation work of establishing good habits and healthy attitudes is that of the home. It is upon that foundation that the school builds.

We here at St. Agatha-St. Aloysius School present to you a well-equipped school with a faculty which is both professionally prepared and personally dedicated to a Catholic Christian education. You have an opportunity which few others enjoy: that is, to be prepared for life in this world and, at the same time, to be prepared for the life to come. In keeping with this goal and in order to facilitate the collaboration and cooperation of all involved: parents, teachers, students, we present this HANDBOOK of rules, regulations and policies of St. Agatha-St. Aloysius School.

Please study it carefully, familiarize yourself with the contents, and keep it on hand for easy reference. AFTER YOU HAVE READ THE CONTENTS OF THIS HANDBOOK CAREFULLY, PLEASE GO OVER THEM WITH YOUR CHILDREN SO THAT THEY WILL ALSO HAVE THE INFORMATION. We ask your cooperation in upholding the guidelines set forth. By adhering to this handbook, we will be better able to make our school the educational institution that can best serve you. We request that you do not seek exceptions from the regulations for your child.

Supplements to this HANDBOOK may be given throughout the school year as the need arises.

Yours in Christ.
SR.SANDRA SABO,SSJ
Principal

****

PHILOSOPHY

It is the purpose of St. Agatha-St. Aloysius School to embrace and promote the aims of Catholic education as defined by the Bishops of the United States in their pastoral message, TO TEACH AS JESUS DID: to proclaim the message of the Gospel, to foster the growth of Christian community, and to involve students in service to others.

St. Agatha-St. Aloysius School strives to integrate religious truths and values with knowledge and skills in order to provide a quality education for all its students. The goals of St. Agatha-St. AloySius School are as follows:

To cooperate with and educate parents so as to assist, guide, inspire and form their children in accordance with Gospel values.

To take the child as he/she is and meet his/her needs educationally, socially & emotionally.

To strive to perfect all good intellectual habits so that the child will be able to think independently and use his/her religious values to assess the world around him/her.

To strive to make students aware of their own culture & dignity as well as that of others, and to develop a sense of Christian fellowship with peers and teachers.

To encourage students to participate and become involved in their neighborhood community of Glenville and in the world around them so that they may take an active part in solving the racial and social problems of today.

To motivate and encourage students to appreciate and celebrate their unique cultural heritage and gifts.

To impart basic knowledge, understanding, appreciation, and skill in other subjects needed for life in a dynamic world; in the fine arts of music and art, in health, science and family living and in physical education and safety.

To teach Christian, Catholic doctrine, truth and prayer and to encourage an ongoing relationship with God and church participation. (Revised 8.22.95)

As a religious school, the path that we choose to travel involves the GOOD NEWS OF JESUS CHRIST. For us, His path is the Way, the Truth, and the Light.

Built into this path are seven Principles which we hope will also serve as the pillars of our school - pillars of strength for us all. These are principles which have traditionally been a part of Black Christian Culture and Community. These principles are:

Nguzo Saba

UMOJA (Unity) - To work for and maintain unity in the family, community, nation and race.

KUJICHAGULI (Self-Determination) - To define ourselves, name ourselves and speak for ourselves, instead of being defined and spoken for by others.

UJIMA (Collective Work & Responsibility) - To build and maintain our community together and to make our brothers and sisters problems our problems and to solve them together.

NIA (Purpose) - To make as our collective vocation the building and developing of our community in order to restore our people to their traditional greatness.

KUUMBA (Creativity) - To do always as much as we can, in the way we can in order to leave our community more beautiful and beneficial than when we inherited it.

IMANI (Faith) - To believe with all our heart in our parents, our teachers, our leaders, our people and the righteousness and victory of our struggle.

UJAMAA (Cooperative Economics) - To build and maintain our own stores, shops, and other business, and to profit together from them.

If we as a family (school, home and community) can embrace these principles and pass them on through the education we provide, then we will truly be fulfilling our responsibility: "TO TEACH AS JESUS DID."

MISSION STATEMENT

IT IS THE PURPOSE OF ST. AGATHA-ST. ALOYSIUS SCHOOL TO PROCLAIM THE MESSAGE OF THE GOSPEL, TO FOSTER THE GROWTH OF CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, AND TO INVOLVE STUDENTS IN SERVICE TO OTHERS; THE SCHOOL INTEGRATES RELIGIOUS TRUTHS AND VALUES WITH KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS DURING INSTRUCTION AND ITS ACTIVITIES IN ORDER TO PROVIDE A QUALITY EDUCATION FOR ALL ITS STUDENTS. (Revised 9-21-98)

ST. PATRICK SCHOOL

FAMILY HANDBOOK

INTRODUCTION AND PHILOSOPHY

PHILOSOPHY OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

We believe that a philosophy of Catholic education begins with faith that God, in creating, gifted us with life. He became one of us in His Son Jesus, and in the person of His Spirit awaits our response to His unconditional overture of love. Jesus remains with the community He formed, witnessing and sharing the Good News in every age and with all people, ever yearning for a return of love either by a sincere response to conscience or by membership in His Church. It is from this perspective that the educational ministry of the Catholic community flows.

We believe that education which is Catholic begins, with life, in the heart of the family. Parents, the primary educators, seed and nourish values deeply human, deeply spiritual. Affirmed, treasured, and supported by the loving witness of Christian faith communities, the child continues a life-long response to God's love in growing and excelling through responsible involvement in the academic, cultural, and civic concerns of daily life.

We believe that the Catholic school is sensitive to the mandate of Jesus: "Love one another as I have loved you" as the goal toward which all Catholic education tends. The school community, in sharing this vision within an atmosphere designed to celebrate and practice love of God and neighbor, is the most effective means available to the Church for the education of youth. Among the values prized in the Catholic school are self-worth, self-discipline in the search for a moral way of life, and appreciation for our American heritage. With deep concern for their brothers and sisters, young people in our Catholic schools form their

personal response to truth, justice and love to God their Maker.

MISSION STATEMENT

St. Patrick School is a Catholic School in the Diocese of Cleveland, Ohio. The mission of St. Patrick School is to live and teach the Gospel message. We are dedicated to the formation of youth according to our Catholic Traditions within an innovative academic environment which provides students with the opportunity to develop spiritually, academically, and socially to the best of their abilities.

Objectives of Education

1. To communicate the gospel message of Jesus.
2. To provide opportunities to build and experience a faith community.
3. To orient students to the responsibility and experience of service because of their membership in the Christian community.
4. To provide students with opportunity for growth in prayer.
5. To provide instruction in religious truths and values in such a way that they become an integrated part of the school program.
6. To develop a faculty and staff who by their presence and teaching express on integrated approach to learning and living in their lives.
7. To provide an academic program and environment conducive to the optimal development of each student.

As your child's prime educator, may we ask you to cooperate with the following:

1. Build religious celebrations and family prayer into your life style. Attend weekend Mass and encourage stewardship through the use of the Sacraments and church envelopes.

2. It is the parents' responsibility to provide the basic needs for their children such as food, shelter, safety, and love. Until the child has these, he/she will not be ready to learn.

3. Provide the proper materials for study, both at home and in school.

4. Be sure your child's school attire, as established by the school is complete and kept in good condition.

5. Encourage regular attendance. This instills within the child the importance of his presence in school.

6. Always cooperate with the teacher and the school, as they are expected to do with you. Welcome their suggestions or advice. Never assume that the teacher is inadequate, if your child is not learning, or criticize the teacher in front of your child. Investigate all the facts before passing judgment. If you have a complaint, take it up with the school, going through the proper channels, starting with the teacher, then the principal, the parish school board, and finally the Diocesan School Board.

7. Hold the teacher and the school's rules and regulations in high regard. Your child will act accordingly.

8. Do not expect the teacher to solve <u>your</u> discipline problems. Discipline begins in the home and is only continued in the school.

9. Set your standards high, but be honest with yourself as to your child's potential and expect from him/her only what he/she can give.

10. When your child's report card is at home, praise him/her first in the subjects in which he/she has done satisfactorily or made an improvement. Then encourage him/her to try to do better in areas where improvement is necessary. He/she will then be more receptive to suggestions and will, in his/her own mind, be determined to do better. Never compare your child's grades with those of his friends, brothers, sisters, or your friend's children. He/she is an individual and should be treated as one.

Introduction

MISSION STATEMENT

Saint Rocco School is a Faith Community built upon the beliefs of the Catholic Church. We believe that respect for God, others, and self forms a family-like environment. We are committed to quality Catholic education to all elementary students. This mission is based on the Gospel values.

HISTORY

Since 1914 Italian immigrants, from the near west side of Cleveland, gathered to pray to Saint Rocco. Saint Rocco, who lived in the 1400's, was the son of the governor of Montpellier, France. Orphaned at age twenty, he helped people suffering from the bubonic plague when he went to Italy. When Rocco became infected with the plague, he went to the woods to die. Here he was miraculously fed by a dog, whose master soon found Rocco and looked after him. In 1922 the parish of Saint Rocco was established. In 1924 the Order of Our Lady of Mercy, Mercedarians, came to serve the parish with Father Sante Gattuso, O.deM. who became pastor. In 1927 the Sisters of the Most Holy Trinity, Trinitarians, came to staff the school which was opened September 6, 1927. Beginning with grades kindergarten to grade eight, it grew until the first class graduated June 14, 1934.

PHILOSOPHY

The Faculty of St. Rocco School, believes that "Catholic schools afford the fullest and best opportunity to realize the threefold purpose of Christian education among children and young people. This motivated, we strive to make people's faith become living, conscious, and active through the light of instruction." Thus instruction is offered to all God's children no matter their race, color, creed, or sex.

Understanding that not all children have been endowed with the same talents and abilities an atmosphere of openness and understanding will be provided and maintained for those students who have special education needs.

An integral part of the school program is instruction in religious truths and values. These values permeate the whole atmosphere of the school. Building on this foundation, a curriculum is offered which strives to prepare the students to develop intellectually, morally, emotionally and socially. Instruction in human skills and knowledge will hopefully enable students to reflect the gospel values and to discern the significance of God's plan for His creation.

The primary responsibility for the education of children belongs to parents. This idea is basic to the American way of life and the Christian concepts of the family as the fundamental unity of society. Although this responsibility is shared with schools as a matter of practical necessity, the parent's responsibility remains paramount.

The children tend to emulate their parents. They follow what is done rather than what is said. Therefore, the greatest factor in building a child's intellectual, cultural and moral attitudes is the EXAMPLE the parent provides in the home.

In addition to good example, some other responsibilities as parents are:

1. Provide proper facilities and encourage conscientious completion of assignments.
2. Insist that your children obey the regulations and principles of good behavior. Note their conduct and effort marks. Unsatisfactory marks or failing grades in a subject indicate a need for a conference with the teacher.

3. AVOID CRITICISM OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL POLICY IN FRONT OF YOUR CHILD/REN. Discuss problems directly with the teacher or the principal.
4. Encourage the development of your child's individual talents and interests.
5. Build religious celebrations and family prayer into your life style.
6. Cooperate with the policies and requests throughout this handbook.

If there is a problem, please follow this policy:

1. Go to the source. Speak with the person responsible. If anyone discusses a problem with you, please have them go to the source.
2. If there is a school problem, please use this procedure:
   a. Speak with the teacher.
   b. Speak with the Principal.
   c. Speak with the Principal and the teacher.
   d. Speak with the Pastor.

All parents/guardians are expected to support the P.T.U. (Parent Teacher Unit) through membership, attending meetings, and assisting at functions. This unit will receive the names and phone numbers of all students, unless a letter is sent to the principal regarding this matter.

Periodically pictures are taken for the school, newspaper, or other news media. Unless a special letter is sent to the principal, parents' permission will be assumed during these times.

I-28

Saint Stanislaus School Materials

St. Stanislaus Elementary School
6615 Forman Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44105
(216) 883-3307

Fr. William Gulas, O.F.M. – Pastor

Mrs. Alice Torrence – Principal

Dear Parents/Students,

Welcome to St. Stanislaus Elementary School as we begin our school year. This handbook is of extreme importance and contains very valuable information. It is our hope that each of you, parent and student, will read each article carefully, seriously, and reflectively, and that you will keep it available so that you can refer to it often during the year.

St. Stanislaus offers each student the opportunity, encouragement, and guidance necessary to help his/her needs as an individual, as a member of a social group, and as a citizen. Each student must provide the necessary work, character, willingness to serve, and cooperation required to accomplish these ends.

Parents and teachers are working towards the same goal – the development of our students into fine, fully functioning ladies and gentlemen with excellent academic skills. This goal requires the cooperation and efforts of teachers and parents. School and home are on the same side. We must work together.

Teachers need the support of parents. Please remember to send your child to school ready to learn, well-rested, well-fed, and dressed appropriately for the weather. Send your

child emotionally ready to learn by always speaking respectfully about teacher's actions. Never undermine the teacher's or school's authority by criticizing school policies in front of your child.

The staff feels very keenly the responsibility of gently molding your children into good Christians with the proper respect for the dignity and rights of others, as well as themselves. Teachers endeavor to provide a strong example of respect to students. Children learn by the example teachers and other adults provide.

The rules and guiding principles that follow are designed to ensure the safety of all children and ensure that each child will be able to reach his/her potential in an atmosphere of respect and dignity.

Children have a right to learn, and teachers have a right to teach. Misbehavior on the part of students cannot be allowed to interfere with this process. We want to clearly spell out our expectations so that everyone clearly understands what is meant by appropriate or inappropriate behavior.

We are happy to be of assistance. We wish the best for each family and God's special blessings throughout this school year. We ask that you will join your prayers with ours.

Sincerely,

Alice Torrence
Principal

Fr. William Gulas, O.F.M.
Pastor

PHILOSOPHY

St. Stanislaus School strives to create a Community of Faith which is living and active. We aim to provide instruction in the Catholic faith, and opportunities to practice that faith in an atmosphere rooted in Christian values, principles, ideals, and traditions with an emphasis on the dignity of the person.

Through instruction, example, and guidance, the spiritual, academic, psychological, social, cultural, and physical development of each child is fostered in order to provide a quality education for all.

We believe that the school is in partnership with parents in pursuit of our ultimate goal which is the formation of the whole person in order to prepare him/her to meet the challenges of today's world.

MISSION STATEMENT

St. Stanislaus School is an integral part of the St. Stanislaus community whose shared mission with parents is to facilitate Christian values within the context of the core curriculum. We commit ourselves to the formation of a faith-filled Catholic community, preparing students for spiritual development, and future roles as responsible, knowledgeable, productive Christian individuals.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF ST. STANISLAUS SCHOOL

Goal — St. Stanislaus School will increase their Catholic identity by developing opportunities for faith development of faculty and students.

Objectives

A. To provide the faculty with opportunities for religious education and spiritual growth.

B. To develop faith enriching opportunities for students of St. Stanislaus School.

C. To develop a focus on issues of peace, justice, and the Gospel values.

Goal — St. Stanislaus School will develop and/or improve programs that benefit students' educational needs.

Objectives

A. To raise the overall reading level of our students.

B. To increase schoolwide emphasis of instructional strategies particularly curriculum integration and alternative assessment of students.

C. To take a deeper look at the value of Saxon Math Program already in use at our school.

Goal — St. Stanislaus School will upgrade their technology plan to meet the needs of the students by providing a foundation for life-long learning and success in education.

Objectives

A. To improve the computer skills of the teachers at St. Stanislaus School.

B. To aggressively up-date our technology.

C. Integrate technology throughout the curriculum.

I-33

Luther Memorial School Materials

LUTHER MEMORIAL SCHOOL

OUR MISSION

LUTHER MEMORIAL SCHOOL PROVIDES A QUALITY, CHRIST-CENTERED EDUCATION IN A STRUCTURED ENVIRONMENT THAT NURTURES AND CHALLENGES STUDENTS TO ACHIEVE THEIR GOD-GIVEN POTENTIAL IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HOME AND CHURCH.

4215 Robert Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44109
(216) 631-3640

Dear Luther Memorial School Parent,

Greetings in the name of Jesus, our Savior!

It is my hope that this handbook will be helpful in answering any questions that you may have concerning Luther Memorial School. Even though attempts were made to include the most important topics, you may still have some questions. Please do not hesitate to call the school office, 631-3640, to ask any questions and express any concerns.

By working together as a team, we can give your child the best possible Christian education. Our overall school theme is "Sharing Christ in the City." Cooperation between our school, our homes, and our churches will guarantee the successful implementation of this theme.

May God bless us all as together we help our children in their spiritual, academic, social, emotional and physical growth.

In His Service,

Bill Ronschke
Principal

I-34

Saint John Nottingham Lutheran School Materials

ST. JOHN NOTTINGHAM LUTHERAN
CHURCH & SCHOOL

September 21, 1999

Carolyn Jurkowitz
Catholic Conference of Ohio
Fax # - (614)224-7150

Dear Ms. Jurkowitz:

Here is the information that you requested

Mission Statement –

It is our belief that the one cardinal objective
of education to which all others point
is to develop devotion to God as our Creator,
Redeemer, and Sanctifier, whose love for us
moves us to show in our every act, thought,
word and desire, our love for Him.
"THE FEAR OF THE LORD IS THE BEGINNING OF KNOWLEDGE."
Proverbs 1:7

To bring about such development, it is our constant aim to provide in each and every pupil his or her—FAITH—GOOD WORK—PERSONAL LIFE ADJUSTMENT, which includes training for maximum physical, intellectual, and emotional capabilities of each child, with all due recognition for individual difference through various developmental stages of growth.

This basic philosophy determines the curriculum, content of the course of study, and the environment making up the total teaching-learning situation at St. John.

This statement is part of our Parent Handbook. I'm not sure of the date that it was approved. It was developed by the principal and approved by the St. John School Commission.

We currently have 34 students receiving Scholarships.

Grade 1 – 3 Grade 2 – 7 Grade 3 – 13 Grade 4 – 2
Grade 5 – 7 Grade 6 – 2

Sincerely,

Susan M. Ophardt, Principal

425a

"THE FAMILY OF GOD ...

BEARING FRUIT"

PARENT HANDBOOK

1999-2000

ST. JOHN NOTTINGHAM LUTHERAN CHURCH AND SCHOOL

17403 Nottingham Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44119
(216) 531-1156
Dr. W.P. Marcis, Pastor

1027 East 176th St.
Cleveland, Ohio 44119
(216) 531-8204
Miss Susan Ophardt, Principal

PURPOSE OF THE HANDBOOK

This handbook contains help and information on policies regarding our school, regulations for the pupils and the school calendar, etc. May it prove helpful to parents, pupils and to all others interested in the *Christian* (Christ-centered) education of their children. Let us ever recognize our children as gifts of God and do all we can for their temporal and eternal welfare.

EDUCATION: A LIFELONG PROCESS

God makes clear that Christian education is a lifelong process, and so we must not expect Christian maturity in childhood. We must be willing to wait for the fruit. *Children will simply not hear and now practice* all that they have learned. Not even mature Christian adults do this. *Therefore, evaluating behavior in childhood does not reflect the full effect of a person's training.* This knowledge will keep us from jumping to immature and wrong conclusions and will do much to overcome the tendency to try to judge the value of a Christian school by demonstrable differences between children who attend it and other Christian children who don't. If we accept God's Word and promises at all, we must accept them all the way. Accepting them all the way means believing that, ordinarily, our results in Christian education parallel the amount of effort put forth in teaching God's Word. Unless we want to deny that "The Word of God is quick and powerful" (Hebrews 4:12), we have no other choice. *A thorough Christian education with sound doctrinal teaching and with proper application of doctrine, will provide a foundation for continuing growth and maturation in spiritual matters far beyond the years of school attendance.*

We will, of course, not always be as successful in our school training as we should be. This could be partly due to our mistakes, could be caused by the unwillingness of children to accept our teaching, could be partly due to home situations, and most certainly, to the devil's snares. *But that changes neither the principle nor our faith.* With the faith that God will bless the faithful teaching of His Word, we will be able to take our successes and failures in stride, knowing that the school serves the spiritual needs of both the child and the church.

Luther said, "For it is the duty of father and mother –nay, for this very purpose they were made father and mother – to teach children and lead them to God, not according to their own notion and their own religious persuasion, but according to the command of God."

But, long before this, *God* commanded, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

"He was before all else began and it is His power that holds everything together."

OUR PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

It is our belief that the one cardinal objective
of education to which all others point
is to develop devotion to God as our Creator,
Redeemer, and Sanctifier, whose love for us
moves us to show in our every act, thought,
word and desire, our love for Him.

"THE FEAR OF THE LORD IS THE BEGINNING OF KNOWLEDGE."

Proverbs 1:7

To bring about such development, it is our constant aim to provide in each and every pupil his or her –FAITH –GOOD WORK –PERSONAL LIFE ADJUSTMENT, which includes training for maximum physical, intellectual, and emotional capabilities of each child, with all due recognition for individual difference through various developmental stages of growth.

This basic philosophy determines the curriculum, content of the course of study, and the environment making up the total teaching-learning situation at St. John.

WHY A CHRISTIAN DAY SCHOOL?

In order to carry on the command of Jesus, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you...". St. John Lutheran Church in 1892 established a Christian Day School.

St. John School is maintained by the members of St. John Lutheran Church and assisted by sister congregations in the area. These members believe the school to be essential in carrying out God's command regarding the Christian training of children. They also want to assure themselves and their children of the blessings God has promised to those who give their children a Christian education.

GOD COMMANDS:

"Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Ephesians 6:4

"These words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." Deut. 6:6-7

GOD PROMISES:

"All thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of the children." Isaiah 54:13

"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Proverbs 22:6

WHAT IS EDUCATION IN A CHRISTIAN SCHOOL?

In education, we are concerned with the development of knowledge, ability, skill, attitude and character by means of teaching, study and experience. Christian education has precisely the same general aims, but it is based on the Bible and has three specific goals:

1. To lead the individual to faith in Christ and to keep him in that faith.
2. To help the individual to develop into an even better and more perfect Christian in all of life's relationships, both secular and religious.
3. To keep before the individual the goal of every child of God – Eternal Life.

The Lutheran Day School is the best agency for such Christian education because it provides for the total growth and development of the child. The Bible describes such a complete education in Luke 2:52: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature in favor with God and man."

Four types of growth are included in the educational program thus described:

SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT
INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT
PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVES OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Christian education attempts to guide the child's development in these four areas of growth on a level commensurate with his God-given abilities:

In the development of his SPIRITUAL potentialities. Christian education guides the child to:

1. Acquire a thorough knowledge of God and His Word.
2. Recognize his sin and the need for salvation.
3. Accept Jesus as his Savior through the working of the Holy Spirit.
4. Rely upon God for both temporal and spiritual blessings.
5. Desire to live according to God's law.
6. Utilize the means of grace, namely, the Word and Sacraments.
7. Lead a sanctified life.
8. Desire to lead others to the Savior.
9. Serve the church through the proper stewardship of time, talents, and treasures.

In the development of his INTELLECTUAL potentialities, Christian education guides the child to:

1. Acquire a thorough knowledge of skills in the common branches of learning.
2. Develop an inquiring mind.
3. Develop independent thinking.
4. Acquire a wide range of significant interests.
5. Cultivate desirable and useful work habits and study skills.
6. Evaluate all human knowledge in the light of what God says in the Bible.

In developing his PHYSICAL potentialities, Christian education guides the child to:

1. Regard his body as a "temple of the Holy Spirit."
2. Use his body for the purposes for which God has given it.
3. Acquire and maintain desirable physical and mental habits.

In development of his SOCIAL potentialities, Christian education guides the child to:

1. Lead a Godly life.
2. Be kindly affectioned to his family and associates.
3. Respect, under God, authority of home, school, church and state.
4. Recognize the right, privileges, and obligations of others, as well as his own.
5. Serve as a useful and active citizen in his community.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

St. John Lutheran School is one of the educational agencies of St. John Lutheran Congregation.

The congregation established and continues to support this form of Christian education through the directives of the Voters' Assembly.

The Voters' Assembly executes its will through the School Commission composed of one elected director who appoints 2 additional members: one member appointed by the Board of Directors of St. John: the Pastor of St. John: and the Chairman of the St. John Congregation. The Principal and Vicar are advisory members.

Immediate supervision of the school rests with the PRINCIPAL. He/She must act as the executive director, who, with the help of the faculty and the Administrative Council, suggest changes and policies, and carry out the wishes of the School Commission and the Congregation.

STATE OF OHIO STANDARDS – ACCREDITATION

St. John Lutheran School is a non-public, State of Ohio – approved elementary school. Every effort is made to meet and exceed the standards of the Ohio Department of Education.

TEACHERS

The teachers of St. John Lutheran School are concerned Christian individuals with unique God-given talents and abilities. All teachers are certified by the Ohio State Department of Education. Every effort is made to hire teachers that are members of the Lutheran Church.

HIRING PRACTICES

St. John Lutheran School follows a non-discriminatory policy in regard to the hiring of its staff.

St. John pays equal wages for equal or equivalent positions. The opportunity for employment at St. John is not based on the sex of an applicant.

ADMISSION POLICY

St. John is a school for the training of children of its members, members of sister congregations, and as an agency of outreach for the Church. Sister congregations may have

an arrangement with St. John to help pay the cost of their member children.

Other children, whose parents are interested in Christian Education, may be enrolled. Children whose parents are members of another church denomination or who have no church affiliation may be enrolled after the parents have thoroughly discussed the matter with the principal. Such parents must pay the set tuition for the cost of their children's education as determined by the Voters' Assembly of St. John.

St. John Lutheran School is proud that it has, over the years, admitted students of any race, color, national and ethnic origin to all the rights, privileges, programs, and activities generally accorded or made available to students at the school. It does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national and ethnic origin in administration of its educational policies, admissions policies, scholarship and loan programs, and athletic and other school-administered programs.

I. *ENTRANCE AGE*:

A. Kindergarten pupils must be 5 on or before September 30th.

B. First grade pupils must be 6 on or before September 30th.

II. *ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS*:

A. All students not transferring from another school shall provide proof, birth certificate or other, of proper age as required by the State of Ohio.

B. All new students shall be accepted as probationary for the first semester. Their progress will be reviewed periodically during this time. If the progress is unsatisfactory, the

School Commission may decide that the student not continue at St. John. Final acceptance will be determined upon parent and teacher conferences, and adequate transcript or records from the previous school, observation of academic work and behavior by the teacher, and testing if necessary. Children transferring to our school must have a valid transfer. Tests for proper placement *may be required.* Application for enrollment should be made to the Principal through the school office.

C. *HEALTH REQUIREMENTS*

1. All new students must have a physical (complete medical examination) K-8. All returning students in grades 1, 4 & 7 are required to have a complete medical examination.

I-35

SAINT MARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL MATERIALS

Current Mission Statement:
It is the mission of St. Mark Lutheran School to provide the quality of Christian education that keeps the Light of Christ first and foremost.

Who developed the Mission Statement:
The School board in summer 1999 (revision).

Who officially approved the Mission Statement?
The School Board.

How many students in your school currently receive the scholarship?
46 students

How many scholarship students are at each grade level in your school?
GR. K – 5; 1 – 10; 2 – 12; 3 – 11; 4 – 4; 5 - 3.

St. Mark Lutheran School

1999-2000

Parent-Student Handbook

Some Things Never Change:

Jesus' Love and Promises

Welcome to St. Mark Lutheran School

What we expect of parents...

Become thoroughly informed of the purpose of St. Mark Lutheran School

- Be supportive of and respectful towards the school, the principal, the teachers, and the staff (who all contribute to your child's education)
- Ensure that your child(ren) adhere to the school rules, regulations, and responsibilities

The primary focus of St. Mark Lutheran School is on our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. In all of our goals, Jesus Christ must be preeminent. Because of our commitment to that focus and to our beliefs and philosophy, it is highly inconsistent for any parents to send a child to this school if they:

- Are not a Christian and/or are not interested in learning about Jesus Christ
- Are not living a Christian life or willing to learn how to lead such a life

- Are not a supporting part of a Christian congregation through worship and sharing of time and talents

What we expect of students…

- You are a child of God and as a child of God, you are expected to conduct yourself in a way that will make your life a Christian witness to all.
- You are responsible for your own behavior and attitude
- You are responsible for your own class assignments, tests, and homework
- You are expected to respect, honor, obey, and show Christian love toward teachers, the principal, pastors, and school staff/volunteers to whom God has granted authority in the school
- You are expected to be considerate of others, respect the rights of others, and show respect for their property
- You are expected to know and follow the school rules, regulations, and responsibilities in the handbook and any changes made during the school year as enacted by the teachers, principal, or school board
- Attending church and Sunday school as often as you can is an important part of a relationship with God. St. Mark Lutheran School requires and records church and Sunday school attendance. We encourage you to attend with your parent(s) as a family

What you can expect from us...

- We will be supportive of and respectful towards parents and students
- We will provide an open line of communication
- We will do our best to provide an atmosphere conducive to quality education

"See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God."

I John 3:1

ADMISSIONS

In 1895, when St. Mark Lutheran Church and School were founded, the Christian day school served as an educational arm for the members of the congregation. Today, while still serving members and teaching exclusively the beliefs of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, St. Mark Lutheran School serves families and students from many backgrounds. Some include those from other Lutheran congregations, other Christian denominations, and those with no formal church background. We welcome members of the greater Cleveland community to become involved in our school and the Christian education it offers.

Enrollment Procedures

To enroll a student at St. Mark Lutheran School the following procedures are to be followed:

- Stop in at the school office to pick up an enrollment packet
- Return the completed enrollment form(s) to the school office, along with the enrollment fee

- Schedule an appointment to meet with the school principal and the teacher that your student will have, if accepted, at St. Mark
- When you meet with the principal and the teacher, please bring with you copies of a current report card, copies of any achievement testing, and a letter of recommendation concerning the student's behavior and attitude (this letter should be from a recent teacher or administrator)
- If accepted, the parent(s) will need to sign a release of records forms, so that the records of the student can be transferred from his/her prior school

In all cases, the principal, in conjunction with the cooperating teacher, will make the decision on enrollment and, if necessary, the school board will finalize the decision.

New Student Status

All new students are accepted on a conditional basis for the first quarter. Removal of conditional enrollment is dependent upon satisfactory receipt of transcript of records from the previous school, attendance by parents at the parent teacher

Parent Handbook

1999-2000

West Park Lutheran School
13712 Bellaire Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44135
216-941-2770

WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL

PARENT HANDBOOK
1999-2000

CONTENTS

INTRODUCING OUR SCHOOL
- FORWARD 3
- WHY A LUTHERAN SCHOOL 3
- PHILOSOPHY, PURPOSE 4
- SPONSORING CONGREGATIONS 5
- ACCREDITATION 6
- WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL BOARD 6
- WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL STAFF 6
- WORSHIP 7
- CHAPEL 7
- CURRICULUM, COURSE OF STUDY 8

ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL POLICIES
- ENROLLMENT POLICY 9
- EARLY ENTRANCE 10
- REGISTRATION FEE 11
- TUITION POLICY 11
- TUITION RATES 12
- FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM 12

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE POLICIES
- SCHOOL HOURS 13
- EMERGENCY SCHOOL CLOSING 13
- CALENDAR 14
- ATTENDANCE 15
- LEAVING SCHOOL OTHER THAN REGULAR TIME 15
- ARRIVING AT SCHOOL 16
- AFTER SCHOOL PICK-UP 16

GOING TO AND FROM SCHOOL 16

OPERATIONAL POLICIES
CODE OF CONDUCT 17
EXTENDED CARE PROGRAM 20
COMPUTER AND INTERNET USE POLICY 21
TELEPHONE 22
BICYCLES 22
CAR POOLS 23
SCHOOL VAN 23
TRANSPORTATION REIMBURSEMENT 23
CLEVELAND SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION 23
UNIFORM DRESS POLICY 24
SEX EDUCATION 26
SCHOOL SUPPLIES 26
RECESS 26
LUNCH 26
SCHOOL MILK 26
NOTIFICATION IN CASE OF SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE 27
SEXUAL HARASSMENT/SEXUAL VIOLENCE POLICY 28
POLICY ON YOUTH GANGS 29

ACADEMIC AND CURRICULAR POLICIES
REPORT CARDS AND CONSULTATION 31
MID-QUARTER REPORTS 31
HONOR ROLL AND MERIT ROLL 31
EIGHTH GRAD GRADUATION 31
RETENTION 31
EDUCATIONAL TESTING PROGRAM/ PROFICIENCY TESTS 32
STUDENT ACCIDENT INSURANCE 32
HEALTH SERVICES 33
MEDICATIONS 33
AIDS POLICY 33

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES 34
SPEECH THERAPY 34
TUTORING 34

COCURRICULAR AND EXTRACURRICULAR POLICIES
OUTDOOR EDUCATION 34
JUNIOR HIGH CLASS TRIP 34
SCHOOL PARTIES 35
INVITATIONS 35
DANCE GUIDELINES 35
FIELD TRIPS 36
SCHOOL PICNIC 36
TREATS 36
SPORTS 36
CHEERLEADERS 36
ELIGIBILITY FOR ATHLETICS 37
REGULATIONS FOR LUTHERAN ATHLETIC EVENTS 37
BAND PROGRAM 38
BAND GUIDELINES 38

PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND INFORMATION
PAGE NINETEEN 39
YEARBOOK 39
SCHOOL PICTURES 39
PARENT ORIENTATION 39
PARENT-TEACHER LEAGUE 39
VISITORS 39
SOLICITORS 40
PARENT VOLUNTEERS 40
FAMILY CUSTODIAL SITUATIONS-RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SCHOOL 41
PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING COMPLAINTS 43

INDEX 44

ONE LORD – ONE FAMILY

FORWARD

The purpose of this booklet is to acquaint you with West Park Lutheran School. The objectives, policies, and practices of our school should be understood and deeply appreciated after reading the following pages.

The specific information will be of special importance to our parents and pupils. If kept in a convenient location, this booklet will serve as a ready source of information throughout the school year.

WHY A LUTHERAN SCHOOL

When Jesus said, *"Permit the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not."* This was not merely a suggestion, but rather a command which Christian parents would do well to heed.

Our Lutheran school has been founded on the firm foundation of God's Word. Children attending our school receive regular studies in the Christian religion as commanded by God. *"These words I command you this day shall be in your heart: and you shall teach them diligently to your children."* Deuteronomy 6:6-7

Since there are so many influences in the world that are dangerous to one's faith, a child needs to hear and learn the Word of God constantly and to apply it in all situations of his daily life. *"Train you a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it."* Proverbs 22:6

This can be done only when the entire curriculum and the life of the school are grounded in the Word of God and dedicated

to the purpose of showing the love of the Savior to a world which, without Him, would be lost forever. *"All your children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of your children."* Isaiah 54:13

Consider well the promise of God. *"When he is old he will not depart from it." "Great shall be the peace of your children."*

PHILOSOPHY

We view the whole child as the foremost of God's creation, although alienated by sin. Because of God's love and forgiveness we focus upon redemption for all and strive to lead all to a repentance and growth in the knowledge of God as expressed in his Word.

In search of truth, the Christian acknowledges the supreme authority of God and Scripture as being relevant to our present times and situations. Anything that is taught will be of value if it serves the welfare of society and the glory of God.

Our primary purpose and obligation is to develop in our students such attitudes, habits, and skills as are necessary to train the heart, the mind, and the hands. The social, emotional, and aesthetic capacities need to be satisfied so that the child can live as a free responsible being in Christ, seeking in all things the perfect praise and glory of God.

When certain psychological conditions are recognized such as individual differences, readiness, motivation, purpose, interests, meaning and repetition, the child can learn. He will have the basic knowledge to change and choose his course of action wisely through the use of his senses (experience) and

by reason, intuition, and reliance upon the authority of divine revelation (the Bible).

PURPOSE OF WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL

West Park Lutheran School's main objectives are:

1) the leading of its children to know Christ as their Lord and Savior; and
2) to foster academic excellence.

Specifically, our aims are the following:

I. To provide thorough instruction in God's Word in order that:
   - A. Pupils may learn to trust in Jesus Christ as their living Savior and the only way to heaven.
   - B. Pupils may know what the Lord expects of them as children of God.
   - C. Pupils may willingly do that which is right and God-pleasing and avoid that which is evil.

II. To cooperate with the Christian home and the children that they might be a credit to their parents, an asset to the church and worthy citizens of the community.

III. To provide thorough instructions in all the required elementary and junior high school subjects so that knowledge, when taught in harmony with the Holy Scriptures, may help boys and girls to live successfully and in accord with the Word and will of God.

SPONSORING CONGREGATIONS

BETHANY ENGLISH LUTHERAN CHURCH (ELCA)
15460 Triskett Road
941-7880
Services: 8:30 and 11:00 A.M. (Nursery)
Summer Worship: 5:00 P.M. Saturday and 10:00 A.M. Sunday
Sunday School: 9:45 A.M.
Bible Class: 10:00 A.M.
Rev. Maurice Gold, Interim Pastor

HOLY CROSS LUTHERAN CHURCH (LCMS)
4260 Rocky River Drive
252-2348
Services 8:00, 10:15, and 11:00 A.M.
Christian Education Hour: 9:15 A.M.
Bible Class: 9:15 A.M.
Rev. Myron Prok, Pastor

MOUNT CALVARY LUTHERAN CHURCH (LCMS)
12826 Lorain Avenue
671-2099
Service: 10:30 A.M.
Summer Worship: 9:00 A.M.
Sunday School: 9:00 A.M.
Bible Class: 9:00 A.M.
Rev. Walter Kovac, Pastor

PURITAS LUTHERAN CHURCH (ELCA)
13812 Bellaire Road
251-6722
Service: 10:00 A.M.
Summer Worship: 9:00 A.M.
Sunday School: 9:15 A.M.
Prayer Group: Wednesday 9:30 A.M.
Rev. John Klein, Interim Pastor

ACCREDITATION

West Park Lutheran School is accredited by the state of Ohio for grades Kindergarten through eight. It was granted its initial state charter by the State Board of Education on July 13, 1982. The teachers employed by the school are certified for their grades under the present state laws.

WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL BOARD

Georgann Carte, Sec'y	Bethany
Bonnie Doctor	Mt. Calvary
Walter Faykus	Mt. Calvary
Timothy Hadde, Treas.	Puritas
Edward Himmelein, Chair	Holy Cross
Rev. Walter Kovac	Mt. Calvary
Michael Leininger	Holy Cross
Rae McElyea, Fin. Sec'y	Puritas
Deborah Mickey	Puritas
David Pavlick, V. Chair.	Bethany
Belinda Pesti	Mt. Calvary
Rev. Myron Prok	Holy Cross
Lynn Sparks	Bethany
Ron Tabor	Holy Cross

Glenn Kloha, Principal, ex-officio member

WEST PARK LUTHERAN SCHOOL STAFF

Glenn Kloha	Principal
Joyce Oerkfitz	Kindergarten
Doreen Hurst	Grade One
Cheryl Steinke	Grade Two
Colleen VanLoh	Grade Three
Elaine O'Dea	Grade Four
Susan Chamot	Grade Five
Harold Weseloh	Grade Six
James Hurst	Grade Seven
Michael McDermott	Grade Eight
Anita Andrews	Transportation
Diane Apelt	Secretary
Cindy Archer	Speech Therapist
Barbara Bacon	Psychologist
Edith Bottoms	Aux. Services
Patricia Deutsch	Classroom Aide
Susan Geye	Afternoon Clerk
Ruth Miller	Classroom Aide
Paulette Rush	Nurse
Giancarlo Scalzi	Social Worker
Eileen Starr	Basic Skills

CHRISTIAN VOCATION

Worship the Lord

WORSHIP

Our pupils are expected to attend church and Sunday School faithfully and to take part in extra school religious activities and special programs of our school. We feel that this is a necessary part of the Christian education in the classroom.

Children will be expected to attend church and Sunday School at least 75% of the Sundays during the school year.

Church and Sunday School attendance will be taken in the classroom each Monday and noted on the child's report card.

We invite our parents and children who have no church home to attend one of the four churches in the West Park Lutheran Association. Please contact one of the pastors for information on adult instruction classes. The churches and times of services are listed in the front of this handbook.

The following steps will apply to pupils who are negligent in church attendance.

1. Reminders will be sent home.
2. Contact may be made by the teacher, the principal, a pastor, and/or others to encourage participation in worship and Sunday School.
3. Continued disregard of church and Sunday School attendance may jeopardize enrollment.

CHAPEL

Children's chapel services are held weekly at each campus. Parents and friends are cordially welcome to attend. The services provide an excellent opportunity for development of the art of worship and promote real growth in Christian stewardship. The offerings received at these services will be designated for various mission projects throughout the year. Offering envelopes should be marked with the child's name and the amount enclosed. Parents will receive an account of their children's offerings at the end of the school year.

CURRICULUM

Since our philosophy and purpose are to provide a sound religious education, it is natural that children attending our school receive regular courses in religious instruction in addition to that provided in church and at home. Some of the primary subjects in the religion courses are Bible history, catechism, memorization and Bible reading. We consider these as the foundation upon which the Lutheran school curriculum as a whole is built.

The immediate objective of West Park Lutheran School with respect to the academic branches of study is the development of desirable and necessary skills, abilities, and attitudes. Parents may be assured that every effort is made toward realization of this important objective. Due to our limited class size of twenty-five pupils, the opportunity for close attention to the individual needs of each child is enhanced.

The Ohio state standards for elementary and junior high school outline the curriculum to be followed in all schools in Ohio. West Park Lutheran School carries out this curriculum and, in addition, provides for the spiritual growth of children through its course of study as outlined.

COURSE OF STUDY

Kindergarten	*Grades 1-6*	*Junior High*
Religion	Religion	Religion
Reading Readiness	Language Arts	Language Arts
Math Readiness	Health	Reading
Handwriting	Mathematics	Mathematics
Language Arts	Reading	Science
Art	Science	American History
Health	Social Studies	U.S. History
Music	Physical Education	Civics

Physical Education	Music	Ohio History
Science	Art	Physical Education
Social Studies	Band	Art
		Health
		Music
		Band

Physical Education is required of all pupils in grades K-8. No child will be excused except upon the advice of a doctor. Proper gym uniform is required for physical education class. Points will be deducted for not having proper attire for physical education which will effect the grade given for the quarter. Physical Education begins the first week of school and will held on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Physical education will be conducted by a S.H.A.P.E. certified physical education instructor.

ENROLLMENT POLICY

West Park Lutheran School is operated by the West Park Lutheran School Association, Incorporated which is an association formed by four participating Lutheran churches: Bethany English, 15460 Triskett Road; Holy Cross, 4260 Rocky River Drive; Mt. Calvary, 12826 Lorain Avenue; Puritas, 13812 Bellaire Road.

We exist primarily to offer religious training and academic excellence to children from these four congregations and others who wish to enroll. All must be approved by the school board upon the recommendation of the principal. All children will be enrolled according to the following priorities:

1. Pupils whose parents are members in good standing of Bethany English, Holy Cross, Mt. Calvary, or Puritas Lutheran churches;
2. Brothers and sisters of pupils enrolled;

3. Children who have been awarded a Cleveland Scholarship;
4. Pupils from other Lutheran churches;
5. Pupils of other denominations or with no church affiliation.

The age requirements for entrance are: Kindergarten – 5 years old on or before September 30; first grade – 6 years old on or before September 30. Pupils admitted to first grade must have completed a state chartered Kindergarten program.

All pupils new to the school must present a copy of their original birth certificate at the time of enrollment. Children transferring from other schools must present valid transfers or information from the previous school they attended. If no information on a transferring pupil is received within a reasonable amount of time, we must notify the law enforcement agency in the area where the pupil resides of this fact and the possibility that the pupil may be a missing child.

In accordance with state law, applicants must have the required immunizations. A pre-school check-up and completion of the health record forms are mandatory. Forms and further information are available at the school office. All 7th graders must have the MMR2 immunization.

Applications for enrollment should be made to the principal at the school office. There is an $80.00 non-refundable application fee per student.

Children transferring from another Lutheran school whose parents are members in good standing of another Lutheran church and who transfer membership to a congregation in the West Park Luthern School Association shall be eligible for

the member rate contingent upon approval of the receiving congregation.

West Park is not equipped to deal with ~~seriously~~ mentally and physically handicapped children in need of special care, nor is our school a correctional institution for disciplinary cases.

Enrollments are accepted until the first day of school or until classes are filled to a maximum of 25 pupils.

All pupils will be accepted on a probationary basis. Final acceptance will be determined on the basis of the child's academic and behavioral performance and upon the ability of the school to be of service to the pupil.

Final registration is accomplished by attendance at the Parent Orientation session. No pupil will be allowed to begin school until the first tuition payment and the registration fee have been paid.

After the first four weeks of school, a child may enroll only by approval of the Enrollment and Policy Committee, and board action on the child's enrollment must be taken at the next school board.

HE GATHERS THE LAMBS IN HIS ARMS AND CARRIES THEM CLOSE TO HIS HEART. HE GENTLY LEADS THOSE THAT HAVE YOUNG.

Isaiah 40:11

EARLY ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Consideration for early entrance to kindergarten and first grade will be given to children whose birthdays fall between

October 1 and December 31 of the same year and only if there are not regular pupils on the class waiting list.

Children whose birthdays fall between the dates noted above will be accepted for nine weeks on a trial basis provided they pass a screening test administered by a school psychologist or a psychologist of the parents' choice and at the parents' expense. No early entrance testing will be conducted after the opening of the school year, and all pupils accepted for early entrance must be enrolled on or before the first day in session of the school year.

* * *

West Park Lutheran School admits students of any race, color, national and ethnic origin to all the rights, privileges, programs, and activities generally accorded or made available to students at the school. The school does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national, and ethnic origin in administration of educational policies, admission policies, and other school administered programs.

RAMAH JR. ACADEMY

HANDBOOK

RAMAH JUNIOR ACADEMY
A SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST INSTITUTION
Train up a child in the way he should go...Proverbs 22:6
4770 Lee Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44128
Phone: (216) 581-2626
Fax: (216) 581-4128

Dear Parent – Guardian:

Welcome to a new school year at Ramah Junior Academy. We are so happy you have chosen our school for your child's education. It is our goal to provide a Christian education for all of our students from grades K-10.

The faculty of Ramah Junior Academy believes in a personal God who governs an orderly universe in love and desires a relationship of trust with His creatures. He created social beings capable of entering personal relationships with Himself as well as with each other. In redemption, through the life and death of Jesus Christ, humankind may once again choose the way of trust and obedience which leads to a vastly enriched life on earth and eventually to eternal life.

This bulletin contains policies, procedures, and rules of the school. Please read this information carefully. Become familiar with each item so that you and your child may have an enjoyable, yet meaningful school year.

Sincerely,

LaJuan Marshall
Principal/Teacher

* * * * * * * * * *

LENGTH OF SCHOOL DAY

School Hours: Grades K – 6	9:30 – 3:00	(Mon. – Thurs.)
	8:30 – 2:15	(Friday)
Grades 7 – 10	8:15 – 3:15	(Mon. – Thurs.)
	8:15 – 2:15	(Friday)

ARRIVAL

The doors of the school will be opened at 7:50 am. All students that are eating breakfast will line up immediately. Breakfast is served from 7:50 am – 8:15 am. NO EXCEPTIONS.

CALVARY CENTER ACADEMY

Your Complete Christian School

And these words . . .
Shall be upon your hearts;
And you shall teach them
Diligently to your children . . .
Deuteronomy 6:6-7

Parent-Student Handbook
1999-2000

CALVARY CENTER ACADEMY

Parent-Student Handbok

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION *1*

MISSION STATEMENT *3*

PHILOSOPHY *4*

SCHOOL POLICIES *5-15*
--Admissions
--Attendance
--Code of Conduct
--Discipline
--Dress Code
--Medication

ACADEMIC PROGRAM *16-18*
--Courses of Study
--Curriculum Content
--Grading System & Reporting to Parents

GENERAL PROCEDURES *19-20*
--Classroom Visitations
--Parent Conferences
--Food Service
--Transportation

STUDENT GROUPS & EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES *21-23*
--Chapel
--Choir
--Speech Meet

--Spelling Bee
--Honors Club
--Student Council/Government

PLEDGES 24

POLICY REGARDING TUITION PAYMENT 25

INTRODUCTION

WHAT THE HANDBOOK SEEKS TO DO

This handbook is intended to give parents and students comprehensive guidelines and an understanding of the goals and activities of the Academy. It explains the philosophy, the policies and procedures, and gives information about the curricula.

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Calvary Center Academy admits students of any race, color, nationality and ethnic origin to all programs and learning experiences that it provides. The same policy is practiced in employment.

ACCREDITATION & AFFILIATION

The Academy is chartered by the Ohio Department of Education and is a member of the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI). Calvary Center Academy was established in 1987.

LEVELS OF COURSE WORK

The Academy offers COURSE WORK in Grades K-5.

Mission Statement

The mission of Calvary Center Academy is to promote academic excellence in secular and religious studies, and to facilitate both intellectual understanding and practical application of Apostolic Christian values in the daily lives of our students.

<<<<<>>>>>

"And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

Deut. 6:7

PHILOSOPHY

The Governing Board of Education of Calvary Center Academy is composed of members from the Cleveland Apostolic Ministerial Fellowship elected by the Fellowship. The Board takes the following position regarding all academic programs:

1. *The pursuit of truth is a basic commitment of the Academy and it will seek to discover, apply and communicate truth.*

2. *The entire personality develops and grows through Commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ and search for truth.*

3. *Biblical truth should be at the center and integrated into all curricular and extracurricular experiences of the student.*

4. *Faith and reason are viewed as complementary. The Academy will pursue the integration of faith and learning in all subjects.*

To fulfill these objectives, Calvary Center Academy seeks to provide a learning environment in the Apostolic-Judiac Christian tradition which brings fulfillment of the whole person through the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Calvary Center Academy Governing Board is responsible for and governs the final decisions made by school administration. The board receives periodic reports of the Academy's operations.

I – 39

Westside Baptist Christian School
Materials

Westside Baptist Christian School
Parent – Student Handbook

Revised April 30, 1998

9407 Madison Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44102
216-961-7375 – Phone & Fax
housed in
MADISON AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH

Welcome to Westside Baptist Christian School

It is the desire of all school personnel to work cooperatively with parents and students to provide an atmosphere that will promote positive learning and Godly social behavior. For this cause, certain procedures and regulations have been established for the proper operation of the school. Please read the booklet carefully and use it as a handy reference throughout the year. W.B.C.S. seeks to glorify God in all of its activities. Thank you for your trust in placing your child with us. We pledge to do our utmost to show God's love and faithfulness to your child.

To God be the Glory,

David L. Mossman
Principal

INDEX

I. General School Information

A. Statement of Purpose 7
B. Statement of Faith 7
C. Accreditation and Affiliation 8
D. Board of Education 8
E. Enrollment Policy 9
-- Statement of Nondiscrimination
-- Registration & Enrollment
-- Cleveland Scholarship & Tutoring Program
F. Enrollment Procedures 10
G. School Motto 10
H. School Colors 10
I. School Publication 10
J. School Nurse 11
K. School Psychologist 12
L. School Hours 12
M. School Insurance 12
N. School Office 12

II. School Policies & Procedures

A. Arrival 13
B. Departure 13
C. Visitors 15
D. Unsupervised Activities 15
E. Absentees 15
F. Tardy Policy 16
G. Telephone 17
H. Transportation 17
I. Lost and Found 17
J. School Supplies 18
K. Bathroom 18
L. Medicines 18

III. School Events

A. PTF Events 20
1. Programs
2. PTF Assemblies
3. Classroom Parties
4. Volunteer Services

B. Birthday Celebrations 22
C. Holidays – (what not to promote) 22
D. Parent/Teacher Conferences 22
E. Chapel 22
F. Fire and Tornado Drills 23
G. School Closings 23
H. Lunch 23
I. Library 24
J. Kindergarten Graduation 24
K. Eighth Grade Graduation 25
L. Spelling Bee 25
M. Speech Meet 25
N. Field Trips 25
O. End of year field trip 25
P. Award Assembly 25

IV. Academics

A. Curriculum 26
B. Bible Version 26
C. Standardized Testing 26
D. Grade Placement 26
E. Progress Reports 26
F. Report Cards and Grading System 27
G. Grading Scale 28
H. Promotion/Retention Policy 28
I. Summer School 29
J. Probation 30
K. Honor Rolls 30
L. Late Work Policy 31
M. Homework 32

N. Physical Education.....33
O. Band.....34
P. Music and Art.....34
Q. Computers.....34

V. School Rules
A. Classroom Discipline Procedures.....35
B. Principal Discipline Procedures.....35
C. Corporal Punishment.....36
D. Dress Code.....37
E. Policy on Electronic Toys.....37
F. Policy on Dangerous and/or Offensive Material.....37
G. Social Behavior.....37
H. Building, Grounds, and Safety Regulations.....38
I. Lunchroom Rules.....38
J. Bus Procedures.....40
K. Library Rules.....41

VI. Financial
A. Tuition Policy.....42
B. Explanation of Fees.....43

Appendixes
1. Yearly School Calendar.....44
2. Dress Code.....45
3. Tuition.....48

I. General School Information

Statement of Purpose

It shall be the purpose of Westside Baptist Christian School to provide a quality Christian education in an atmosphere where Godly moral values, as taught in the Word of God are practiced.

W.B.C.S. believes that Christ is the basis of all learning. All subjects will be taught from the Biblical perspective that all truth is God's truth. The educational process is seen as a channel used by the Holy Spirit to bring the student to a personal faith in Jesus Christ and to train the student in godly living.

The student will be taught Biblical principles so he may understand God's plan for his life spiritually, mentally, emotionally, physically, and socially. We wish each student to realize his fullest God-given potential for God's glory.

It shall be the school's purpose to work in harmony with the home as W.B.C.S. believes that a student's success is dependent upon the home sharing and upholding the same principales as the school. The reinforcement of these principles by Bible preaching churches will provide a solid foundation for life.

Statement of Faith

We believe in the plenary, verbal inspiration of the Bible as the only infallible, authoritative Word of God which is the Supreme and final authority in faith and life.

We believe that there is one God, eternally existent in three persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

We believe in the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning death through His bodily resurrection. In His ascension to the right hand of the Father, and His personal return in power and glory.

We believe that man was created in the image of God, and that because of sin he is both physically and spiritually dead and thus is separated from God.

We believe in the resurrection of the crucified body of our Lord, in His ascension into heaven, and His presence at the right hand of God as our High Priest and advocate.

We believe in the resurrection of both saved and the lost...they that are saved unto the resurrection of life and they that are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.

We believe in the "blessed hope" which is personal, imminent pre-tribulational and pre-millennial coming of the Lord Jesus Christ for His church and the eternal security of the believer.

Accreditation and Affiliation

Westside Baptist Christian School is chartered by the Ohio State Department of Education. All our teachers are certified by the State Department of Education. We are affiliated with the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI).

Board of Education

The policies regarding the administration of Westside Baptist Christian School are formulated by the Board of Education. The Board of Education is composed of representatives who are elected annually by sponsoring churches.

I – 40

Second New Hope Christian Academy Materials

STUDENT HANDBOOK

SECOND NEW HOPE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY
2917 EAST 116TH STREET
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44120

STUDENT POLICIES

CODE OF CONDUCT

A code of conduct serves as a guide for behavior and should enable establishment of a positive climate for learning. It provides a detailed plan for how students are expected to behave and suggests options for teachers/students to consider when established policies and rules are broken. It should, in essence, enhance student self-discipline and serve to prevent discipline problems.

A unique characteristic of Second New Hope Christian academy is that its discipline goals and procedures are rooted in the Scriptural understanding of discipleship. Growth in discipleship is the result of the activity of the Holy Spirit working through God's word.

The teacher's goal for good behavior should always be viewed with the understanding of a student's growth as a disciple; and because each person is different, that growth may take different forms at different times.

MY CREED

I am a bright child.
I want to make something of my life.
I was born to win if I do not spend too much
Time trying to fail.

Society will continue to predict, but only
I can determine what I will, can, or cannot do.
I will use each day to the fullest.
I promise that each day shall be gained or not
lost, used, not thrown away.

I have the right to fail, but not the right to
take my teacher and other people with me.
I am the captain of only one life…my own.
Therefore, if I decide to become a failure,
it is my right.

No one will ever hand success to me on a platter.
I must earn it.
And no one will care as much about me as
I must care about myself.

I will succeed.
I believe in what I can become.
I will never say "can't," But rather,
"I will try."
With God all things are possible.

Author Unknown

WORSHIP LIFE

Church Attendance

Since the religious instruction and program of the school are integral part of congregational life, it is the assumed natural outcome that all students worship services regularly and faithfully. Parents strongly urged to attend services with their children.

Children who are not members of Second New Hope will, of course, heed the same admonition for attendance at their respective churches. Families who do not have a church home are cordially invited to attend worship services at Second New Hope and enroll the children in Sunday School.

Chapel/Daily Devotions

A children's chapel service is held every Monday and parents are welcome to attend. Chapel services should not be thought of as taking the place of Sunday Worship Services, but only as supplemental to those.

Each classroom begins and end the school day with devotions led either by the teacher, individual students or small groups.

Student Behavior

Many of the most important lessons in life are learned at home. These lessons must be remembered and practiced at school. The exercise of self-control and self-discipline reflect good home training and are a source of pride for parents. In addition, this offers encouragement to teachers to do their best for pupils, both in and out of the classroom.

Discipline is a natural and normal part of discipleship. Dealing with individual discipline needs is therefore, a legitimate use of a teacher's time and talents.

Rules may be established by each classroom teacher. These will be, generally, specific to that classroom situation.

STUDENT PLEDGE

The student pledge describes ten rules that form the basic behavior standards at Second New Hope Christian Academy.

AS A STUDENT OF SECOND NEW HOPE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY, I WILL:

- Show love and respect for the Lord.
- Show respect for myself.
- Respect teachers and other adults.
- Respect other students and their belongings.
- Be in attendance at school regularly, so that I might learn the skills I need.
- Learn to listen and follow directions.
- Listen attentively to instruction from my teachers and other adults in charge of school activities.
- Complete all assigned work to the best of my ability.
- Recognize that school is my work and doing my best work is expected, if I am to succeed.
- Keep quiet in the building (church, halls, lavatories, and classrooms).

C.C.I.S.

CLEVELAND COMMUNITY ISLAMIC SCHOOL

MORAL AND ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE IS OUR GOAL

7301 SUPERIOR AVENUE

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

(216) 431-2088

HANDBOOK
1999/2000

INDEX

History 1
Mission Statement 2
1999/2000 School Year Schedule 3
Admission 4-6
Expectations 7
Student's Responsibility 8
Attendance 9
Daily Schedule 10
Reporting Pupil Progress 11
Pupil Cumulative Records 12
Promotion and Retention 13
Discipline 14
Student Conduct Code 15-16
C.C.I.S. School Rules 17-18
Educational Program 19
Curriculum 20-21
C.C.I.S. Uniforms 22-23
School Supply List 24-25

C.C.I.S. 7301 Superior Ave.
Cleveland Community Islamic School Cleveland, Ohio44103
Moral and Academic Excellence is our goal (216)-431-2088

Cleveland Community Islamic School is a full-time Islamic School with a regular school curriculum. With the dedication of a few staff and parents, the school started its operation in the 97/98 school year with a handful of students. The school operates seven hours a day, five days a week, including lunch time and prayer (Salat). School hours are 8:00 am to 3:00 pm.

Staff-- The school has over ten teaching staff who are graduates and postgraduate professionals in different fields of study. Our staff consists of different Nationalities (Americans as well as those from overseas).

Charter-- The school is under the process of being chartered by the Ohio State Board of Education. The Charter process is expected to be completed this school year (98/99 school year).

Location-- The school is centrally located on the product or service and the physical facility which is on 73rd on Superior Avenue.

Visitation-- Please come and visit us, we offer a better education and moral excellence.

C.C.I.S. 7301 Superior Ave.
Cleveland Community Islamic School Cleveland, Ohio44103
Moral and Academic Excellence Tel: (216 431-2088
is our goal Fax: (216) 431-2088

MISSION STATEMENT

BISMILLAH (IN THE NAME OF ALLAH)
Our mission at The Cleveland Community Islamic School (C.C.I.S.) is the mission of discharging our sacred duty to humanity. The sacred duty prescribed to us by Allah (The Almighty God). The sacred and incumbent duty of providing meaningful and useful knowledge to all. In line with our Islamic beliefs, knowledge and its applications is not a privilege, a pastime or a hobby, rather it is incumbent and a must upon every male and female. Furthermore, it is the absolute fundamental right of every child to be well-grounded with the best knowledge and training there is.

SUBHANA ALLAH (GLORY BE TO ALLAH)
In keeping with these, it is the goal of C.C.I.S to provide knowledge and training in moral and academic excellence to each student in the school. This knowledge and training by the grace of Allah, will be planned in a conducive Islamic environment to fully equip each student with the wisdom and the understanding that will enable him or her to skillfully, efficiently and successfully face the challenges of this life and to have a very strong hope of success for the eternal life.

INSHA ALLAH (GOD WILLING)
It's also the hope of C.C.I.S. that this knowledge and training by the power the authority and the will to Allah, will give the student the upper hand to be: (1) a believer (a logical and a rational thinker, and morally and ethically conscious person); (2) an executor of good deeds (such as a peacemaker, a tolerator, an organizer, a leader, a follower, a trainer, a

respector, a contributor, an appreciator, a grateful and thankful person, a caretaker, a responsible and an honest person, a compassionate and loving person, a visionary, a pioneer, an inventor, a producer, a designer, a builder, ...an establisher of a civilization and a middle nation that is just and fair to all); (3) a leader and an adviser in the truthfulness; and (4) above all, a very patience, decent, righteous, God-fearing person.

KINDERGARTEN GUIDE

DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND, OFFICE OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Acknowledgments ii
2. The Ministry of Teaching iii
3. Philosophy and Goals of Catholic Education iv
4. Introduction vi
5. Kindergarten Curriculum Overview vii
6. How to Use This Guide ix
7. The Kindergarten Classroom 1
   - Suggested Classroom Furnishings 2
   - Basic Teacher Supplies 3
   - Classroom Schedule 4
   - Learning Centers 6
   - "The First Day!" 15
   - Classroom Management 18
   - Transitional Activities 21
   - Suggestions for Appraising Student Progress 23
     - Sample Progress Report
     - Sample Kindergarten Certificate
8. Curriculum Application/Integration 27
   - Religion 29
   - Language Arts 65
   - Mathematics Readiness 79
   - Social Studies 101

Health and Safety 113
Science 125
Art 141
Music 159
Phyical Education 171

9. Appendix A – Technology ..... A-I

10. Appendix B – Field Trips ..... B-I

11. Appendix C – Cooking Experiences ..... C-I

The Ministry of Teaching

We are joined together in a common ministry.

We are called to communicate the Gospel to young children.
We need each other.
The children need each of us.
We need the children.

We will move among them with joy,
Joy in living,
Joy in being the people of God,
Joy in living and learning with young children.

We will move among them with love,
Love of God,
Love for each other,
Love for young children.

We will move among them with sensitivity,
Sensitivity to their needs,
Sensitivity to our own needs,
Sensitivity to God at work in the world.

We are joined together in a common ministry.

We are called to live among children in many ways
That speak to the good news of God's love.

Source Unknown

DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND
PHILOSOPHY OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

SOURCES

WE BELIEVE that a philosophy of Catholic education begins with faith that God, in creating, gifted us with life, became one of us in His Son Jesus, and in the Person of His Spirit awaits our response to His unconditional overture of love. Jesus remains with the community He formed, witnessing and sharing the Good News in every age and with all people, ever yearning for a return of love either by a sincere response to conscience or by membership in His Church. It is from this perspective that the educational ministry of the Catholic community flows.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

WE BELIEVE that education which is Catholic begins, with life, in the heart of the family. Parents, the primary educators, seed and nourish values deeply human, deeply spiritual. Affirmed, treasured, and supported by the loving witness of Christian faith communities, the child continues a lifelong response to God's love in growing and excelling through responsible involvement in the academic, cultural, and civic concerns of daily life.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

WE BELIEVE that the Catholic school is sensitive to the mandate of Jesus: "Love one another as I have loved you" is the goal toward which all Catholic education tends. The school community, in sharing this vision within an atmosphere designed to

celebrate and practice love of God and neighbor, is the most effective means available to the Church for the education of youth. This vision motivates students to grow academically, culturally, and socially. Among the values prized in the Catholic school are self-worth, self-discipline in the search for a moral way of life, and appreciation for our American heritage. With deep concern for their brothers and sisters, young people in the Catholic day schools and the parish schools of religion form their personal response in truth, justice and love to God their Maker.

GOALS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN THE DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND

1. To communicate the Gospel message of Jesus.

2. To provide opportunities to build and experience a faith community.

3. To orient students to the responsibility and experience of service because of their membership in the Christian community.

4. To provide students with the opportunity for growth in prayer.

5. To provide instruction in religious truths and values in such a way that they become an integrated part of the school program.

6. To develop a faculty and staff who by their presence and teaching express an integrated approach to learning and living in their lives.

7. To provide an academic program and environment conducive to the optimal development of each student.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most vital issues in the educational world is the instruction of young children. The current emphasis upon early childhood education represents a logical response to the urgent needs within our society today.

Educational research indicates that the early years are the most crucial for learning and that the environment of these years permanently affects the child's total development and personality. Therefore, any effective educational program must begin with the very young child.

Philosophy and Goals of the Kindergarten Program

We, as Christian educators, believe that the major purpose of the Catholic school is to educate the whole person in the relationship of a total family community. Within the school community, teachers must be prepared to create an atmosphere enlivened by the Gospel spirit of freedom and charity, based on the wholeness of human knowledge and culture through the teachings of Christ.

A balanced Catholic kindergarten program must be a synthesis of all that is best in curriculum design. It is within this setting that the child begins to develop as a unique person through "schooling." Provided with a variety of

opportunities, the child interacts with his social and natural environment in order to build a foundation for later learning. The whole process of educating the kindergarten child must be conceived not as a series of individual pieces, but as a whole, having its impact upon a total human being. Kindergarten helps the transition from home to school.

While cognitive, affective, and psychomotor growth are all part of the life of the five-year-old, care must be taken not to over-emphasize mastery of subject matter, not to forget the personal-social-emotional growth of the individual. Each child should experience success and gain a positive self-image. A happy child who is eager to come to school is the most important achievement of the kindergarten year. The student should:

1. Develop a positive self-image and an appreciation of the personal worth and dignity of every individual.

2. Gain and use knowledge to make sound judgments based on Christian principles and to think independently through a hierarchy of values.

3. Be a witness for Christ through growth in home life and in the total parish community, participate in the sacramental life of the Church with concern for and service to all.

4. Acquire appropriate behavior, attitudes, values, and knowledge about physical, social, intellectual, and a spiritual well-being.

5. Learn to accept change intelligently and creatively by the use of communication arts and skills effectively in daily living.

6. Value the arts as a necessary and fundamental part of life; be appreciative of the countless ways in which beauty is experienced, and be aware of music as one emotional expression of normal, health, happy living.

7. Become aware of mathematics as a means of communication, thinking accurately in abstract situations, and gaining insight and knowledge through logical thinking.

8. Develop a sound physical body through a series of activities based on refinement of skills and maintenance of fitness.

9. Grow in the ability to make choices, participate actively in learning, and accept consequences.

KINDERGARTEN CURRICULUM OVERVIEW

RELIGION READINESS is a vital part of the Catholic School Kindergarten Program. From concrete life experience, the child learns the meaning of love and being loved in a family setting. Children realize that they are special not only in their own family, but in God's family through Baptism. In a loving atmosphere of security and trust, the child is introduced to the loving goodness of God as shown in the gifts of creation and through His greatest gift, Jesus. By becoming acquainted with the life of Jesus, the child learns by being guided by the Spirit of Love to witness to God's love in the world.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS are fostered when children have the spontaneity and encouragement to express their ideas verbally through written or picture form; listening to, sharing, and enjoying stories, poetry, and dramatic play.

Language is a means of sharing wonder through social patterns based on specific skills: listening, speaking, reading, and thinking.

READING READINESS begins at birth and continues throughout a lifetime. It comes through many informal and planned activities of the family and school environment through field trips, show and tell, and audio-visual materials. Some activities are: learning left to right, top to bottom progression, eye-hand coordination, recalling stories and happenings in sequence, following directions, perceiving rhyming words, recognizing the alphabet in mixed order along with sounds, and learning to appreciate books through hearing stories read aloud and taking part in picture reading.

Reading is treated separately from the other communication skills; however, they are taught together in a kindergarten readiness program: phonics, reading, writing, listening, speaking, and literature appreciation.

Children are offered opportunities for reading according to their own readiness level. Print and decoding skills are offered to children in a multi-level format.

HANDWRITING is not considered a formal learning area in kindergarten. However, work and play with blocks, clay modeling, finger painting, coloring, and use of scissors build eye-hand coordination which is essential for this later-acquired skill. As children individually evidence a desire to print, they are shown the correct letter forms and instructed to write on the baseline. Children are encouraged to use their natural hand preference for all hand work.

MATHEMATICS READINESS is acquired through informal group activities and planned experiences which occur in games and discovery in working with manipulative

materials. They include rote counting, recognizing and understanding the meaning of the numerals from 1 to 20, learning about comparisons, the calendar, the clock, money, measurement, cluster counting, sets, one-to-one correspondence, equivalence, geometric shapes, simple oral problems, and addition readiness.

HANDBOOK
FOR
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION
DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND
1997

1. FORWARD
2. Chapter I:
   SCHOOL PERSONNEL
3. Appendix I:
   SCHOOL PERSONNEL
4. Chapter II:
   EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
5. Appendix II:
   EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
6. Chapter III:
   PUPIL PERSONNEL
7. Appendix III:
   PUPIL PERSONNEL
8. Chapter IV:
   SELECTED LEGAL TOPICS
9. GUIDELINES FOR CATHOLIC
   ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
10. GENERAL INDEX

FOREWARD

Catholic elementary schools in the Diocese of Cleveland are independent units under the authority of the local parish or religious community. In parish schools the final authority for all decisions resides with the pastor. In schools owned and operated by a religious community, the final authority resides with the major superior or designated representative. Catholic schools not affiliated with a parish or religious community have a designated ecclesiastical liaison. All Catholic schools are subject to the Bishop of the Diocese in matters of faith and morals and in all other matters prescribed by the Code of Canon Law.

The services provided by the Secretariat for Education are intended to help the schools maintain quality educational programs and to implement the educational mandates applicable by law. The Office also acts as a liaison between the schools and the Ohio Department of Education. Schools pay an annual fee to the office for the delivery of these services:

1. Catechetical Services
2. Curriculum Services, including
   a. Development of Curriculum
   b. Coordination of inservice for teachers and administrators to implement the curriculum and to update them on current educational issues
   c. Coordination of standardized testing programs (basic competency and basic skills)
3. General administrative advice and consultation
4. Teacher and administrative certification/ licensure coordination

5. Consultation regarding potential legal concerns
6. Government Programs Administration
7. Buildings and Grounds Consultation
8. Development and Public Relations Consultation

Other services are provided by the diocese when possible, especially when it is to the advantage of the schools to act as a group rather than as individual units. For example, schools may also purchase services from other diocesan agencies such as, hospitalization, pension, unemployment, workers compensation, and data processing.

The contents of this handbook are offered as suggested guidelines to principals and pastors in order to help maintain our schools as centers of quality Catholic education. These are recommended guidelines and are not binding on parish or private schools unless officially adopted.

Each parish/private school should be certain that student/parent and faculty handbooks are adopted, and that these handbooks are up-to-date. Copies are to be provided to parents, students, and faculty when they are adopted and/or amended.

Companion volumes include but are not limited to:

1. Parish As Employer
2. State and Federal Programs Manual

* Throughout this handbook the word "parent" includes any court-appointed legal guardian who has primary responsibility for the child.

DIOCESAN VISION STATEMENT

We are the people of God in the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland, continuing the journey of faith begun in 1847 by pioneers who explored the wilderness and farmers who tilled the earth and immigrants, wave upon wave, who built the cities and worked in the factories.

We are women and men of faith and courage and love; a people come from many lands and places – some long ago, some recently; a people who have suffered – and who still suffer – from violence, from poverty, from discrimination; a gifted people, a diverse people, a people united through the power of the Holy Spirit.

Faith-filled, we have built churches to pray in and schools to hand on the faith to our children and hospitals and orphanages and settlement houses to care for those in need.

Enriched by our many cultures and voices and called through faith and Baptism, we proclaim God's living Word; we witness to God's presence in all of life; we celebrate God's love in worship and prayer.

Responding to the needs and challenges we now face:

with faith *received from those who have gone before us nurtured in prayer and worship together; We pass this faith on to our children and to those who have not yet heard the Good News.*

with love *binding us together and reaching out with compassion; We serve our brothers and sisters in need.*

with hope *relying on the power of the risen Christ and the grace of God at work within us; We extend the reign of God in this time and place.*

DIOCESAN ADMINISTRATION MISSION STATEMENT

Promulgated September 11, 1998

As members of the diocesan staff,
we support the bishop in ministering to the people of God
by working together to provide vision, leadership and service
to continue the mission of Jesus to transform the world.

As a community, we are committed to live by these values:
Faith – Our ministry is rooted in the Gospel of Jesus and the Teaching and Tradition of the Catholic Church. We joyfully proclaim God's presence in our midst through service centered in prayer.

Dignity – We reverence each person as created and loved by God. Serving in a spirit of love and compassion, we embrace and celebrate the diversity of gifts among us.

Stewardship – We are responsible to fulfill our roles with integrity through the wise and careful use of diocesan resources and or individual gifts in a manner that reflects excellence and gives glory to God.

Justice – We extend the Reign of God by co-creating a world where every person is loved. With others, we form relationships and structures which promote life, foster freedom, invite reconciliation, and build communities of hope.

MISSION STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARIAT FOR EDUCATION

The Secretariat for Education witnesses to the Gospel
Through the teaching mission of the Catholic Church.
We commit our expertise, experience, and energies
to lead and assist
those who carry out the educational ministries
of the Diocese of Cleveland.

Our **Core Values** include:

Dignity of Person. We believe in the dignity of each person, created in God's image and likeness, loved and called by God to life everlasting. Therefore, we treat each person with respect and dignity.

Stewardship. We believe tht we are responsible to fulfill our specific role in ways that properly utilize the environment and the resources entrusted to us.

Service. We believe that each person is called to achieve full potential of mind, body and spirit. To enable the fulfillment of this potential, we pledge to render service to all with sensitivity, compassion, and commitment.

MISSION STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

We are a Faith Community in Formation.
We are committed to the educational mission of the Catholic
Church in the elementary and secondary schools.
Therefore, our mission is to lead, assist, and support
Catholic schools in providing quality education
infused with gospel values.

CODE OF CANON LAW
RELATIVE TO Catholic EDUCATION IN GENERAL

Following are the canons from the English translation of the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* pertinent to Catholic Education in general (793-975) and Catholic schools in particular (796-806).

Catholic Education

Can. 793 1 Parents, and those who take their place, have both the obligation and the right to educate their children. Catholic parents have also the duty and the right to choose those means and institutes which, in their local circumstances, can best promote the Catholic education of their children.

2 Parents have moreover the right to avail themselves of that assistance from civil society which they need to provide a Catholic education for their children.

Can. 794 1 The church has in a special way the duty and the right of educating, for it has a divine mission of helping all to arrive at the fullness of Christian life.

2 Pastors of souls have the duty of making all possible arrangements so that all the faithful may avail themselves of a Catholic education.

Can. 795 Education must pay regard to the formation of the whole person, so that all may attain their eternal destiny and at the same time promote the common good of society. Children and young persons are therefore to be cared for in such a way that their physical, moral and intellectual talents may develop in a harmonious manner, so that they may attain

a greater sense of responsibility and a right use of freedom, and be formed to take an active part in social life.

Schools

Can. 796 1 Among the means of advancing education, Christ's faithful are to consider schools as of great importance, since they are the principal means of helping parents to fulfill their role in education.

2 There must be the closest cooperation between parents and the teachers to whom they entrust their children to be educated. In fulfilling their task, teachers are to collaborate closely with the parents and willingly listen to them; association and meetings of parents are to be set up and held in high esteem.

Can. 797 Parents must have a real freedom in their choice of schools. For this reason Christ's faithful must be watchful that the civil society acknowledges this freedom of parents and, in accordance with the requirements of distributive justice, even provide them with assistance.

Can. 798 Parents are to send their children to those schools which will provide for their Catholic education. If they cannot do this, they are bound to insure the proper Catholic education of their children outside the school.

Can. 799 Christ's faithful are to strive to secure that in the civil society the laws which regulate the formation of the young, also provide a religious and moral education in the schools that is in accord with the conscience of the parents.

Can. 800 1 The Church has the right to establish and to direct schools for any field of study or any kind and grade.

2 Christ's faithful are to promote Catholic schools, doing everything possible to help in establishing and maintaining them.

Can. 801 1 Religious institutes which have education as their mission are to keep faithful to this mission and earnestly strive to devote themselves to Catholic education, providing this also through their own schools which, with the consent of the diocesan Bishop, they have established.

Can. 802 1 If there are no schools in which an education is provided that is imbued with a Christian spirit, the diocesan Bishop has the responsibility of ensuring that such schools are established.

2 Where it is suitable, the diocesan Bishop is to provide for the establishment of professional and technical schools, and of other schools catering to special needs.

Can. 803 1 A Catholic school is understood to be one which is under the competent ecclesiastical authority or of a public ecclesiastical juridical person, or one which in a written document is acknowledged as Catholic by the ecclesiastical authority.

2 Formation and education in a Catholic school must be based on the principles of Catholic doctrine, and the teachers must be outstanding in true doctrine and uprightness of life.

3 No school, even if it is in fact Catholic, may bear the title 'Catholic school' except by the consent of the competent ecclesiastical authority.

Can. 804 1 The formation and education in the Catholic religion provided in any school, and through various means of social communication, is subject to the authority of the church. It is for the Episcopal Conference to issue general norms concerning this field of activity and for the diocesan Bishop to regulate and watch over it.

2 The diocesan Bishop is to be careful that those who are appointed as teachers of religion in schools, even non-Catholic ones, are outstanding in true doctrine, in the witness of their Christian life, and in their teaching ability.

Can. 805 In his own diocese, the diocesan Bishop has the right to appoint or to approve teachers of religion and, if religious or moral considerations require it, the right to remove them or to demand that they be removed.

Can. 806 1 The diocesan Bishop has the right to watch over and inspect the Catholic schools situated in his territory, even those established or directed by members of religious institutes. He has also the right to issue directives concerning the general regulation of Catholic schools; these directives apply also to the schools conducted by members of a religious institute, although they retain their autonomy in the internal management of their schools.

2 Those who are in charge of Catholic schools are to ensure, under the supervision of the diocesan Bishop, that the formation given in them is, in its academic standards, at least as outstanding as that in other schools in the area.

PHILOSOPHY OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Office of Catholic Education
Diocese of Cleveland, Ohio

SOURCES

WE BELIEVE that a philosophy of Catholic education begins with faith. God, in creating us, gifted us with life, became one of us in Jesus, and in the Person of the Spirit awaits our response to this unconditional love. Jesus remains within the human community witnessing and sharing the Good News in every age and with all people. We return God's love by a sincere response to conscience and by membership in the Church. It is from this perspective that the education ministry of the Catholic community flows.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

WE BELIEVE that education, which is Catholic begins with life in the heart of the family. Parents, the primary educators, seed and nourish values deeply human, deeply spiritual. Affirmed, treasured, and supported by the loving witness of Christian faith communities, the child continues a lifelong response to God's love through involvement in the academic, cultural, social, and civic concerns of daily life.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

WE BELIEVE the Catholic school exists to teach the mandate of Jesus: "Love one another as I have loved you." This is the goal of all Catholic education. The school community, in sharing a global vision within

an atmosphere designed to celebrate and practice love of God and neighbor, is the most effective means available to the Church for the education of youth. This vision motivates students to grow academically, physically, culturally, and socially. Among the values prized in the Catholic school are self-worth, self-discipline in the search for a moral way of life, and appreciation for our American heritage. With deep concern for their sisters and brothers, young people in Catholic day schools form their personal response in truth, peace, justice, and love.

Diocese of Cleveland
Office of Catholic Education

DISTRICT PLAN
FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
August 1998

GOAL I

Our **CATHOLIC IDENTITY** will permeate every aspect of the school climate and program and will guide staff selection and professional development.

A. Administration and faculty will engage in study and reflection on the core documents and core values of the Catholic faith.

B. Appropriate certification as catechists and catechetical leaders will be maintained by teachers

and administrators according to the guidelines of the diocesan Religious Education Office.

C. Schools will show tangible evidence of being Catholic through their expression of community, message, service, and worship.

D. Eucharist will be revered as the center of our lives, and thus liturgy will receive appropriate attention in its preparation and celebration.

E. School communities will strive to form a faith community with its foundation in the parish and the diocese.

F. The school administration will ensure that a Catholic philosophy of education permeates instruction by providing faith formation opportunities for faculty; engaging with staff in regular review of the curriculum; and performing regularly scheduled class visitation.

G. The religious heritage strand in each subject area curriculum will receive appropriate emphasis to ensure that Catholic values and social justice principles are essential elements in student learning.

H. The school administration will review hiring practices and orientation programs to ensure that religion is taught by practicing Catholics.

I. Parents and families will receive support from the school as integral members of the school's community of faith for the enrichment of their faith lives.

GOAL II

All schools will engage in **PLANNING** to ensure the continued presence of Catholic education in every area of the diocese.

A. Elementary schools will engage in Catholic Schools Futuring, a six year cyclical strategic planning process.

B. All schools will be accredited by the Ohio Catholic School Accrediting Association by the year 2002, and will renew accreditation on a six year cycle.

C. In addition to North Central Association Accreditation, high schools address the Catholicity of their schools through a Catholic Identity goal derived from their mission statement and verified by the Ohio Catholic School Accrediting Association.

D. Schools located in areas of growth, increasing population, high poverty, decreasing population, and/or financial concerns will collaborate with neighboring parishes and schools to enable all families who desire a Catholic education to obtain it and to maintain viable Catholic schools in all areas of the diocese.

E. All schools will provide parents with opportunities for involvement in planning and implementation of programs not only as volunteers, but as investors for the future.

GOAL III

IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING will guide decisions about professional development, curriculum, instruction, assessment, program, staffing and facilities.

A. Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP) will be based on student needs, related to the school's continuous improvement plan as well as this Office of Catholic Education District Plan.

B. Curriculum and instruction will be adapted to the specific needs of the local student population to ensure acceptable competence and proficiency levels.

C. The school program will address the holistic needs of students through curricular and extra-curricular activities as well as educational options where feasible.

D. Decisions about staffing and facilities will take into account both proper stewardship of limited resources and the best way to respond to student needs based on results of systematic planning.

Goal IV

TECHNOLOGY will be an integral part of the tools for learning in every school in the diocese.

A. Schools will establish a technology committee and develop a technology plan including securing resources for the integration of technology throughout the curriculum.

B. Schools will investigate, experiment with, and integrate forms of technology that promote increased and effective student learning.

C. Schools will align their technology efforts with the mission statement and competency outcomes of the Technology Department of the Office of Catholic Education to assure appropriate skills development for students in the 21st century.

D. Schools will provide ongoing staff development in appropriate use of technology and related issues.

Language Arts '93

Catholic Diocese of Cleveland

DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF CHRISTIAN VALUES

The development and application of Christian values is a vital and integral component of our Diocesan Graded Course of Study in Language Arts—and all subject areas.

While, for the most part, formal and specific actions are not detailed within the instrument, it is the responsibility of the individual teacher to recognize and include these values as they relate to what is being taught within the entire teaching process. The Christian values which have been identified as those that should be developed and applied in our teaching of Language Arts are the following:

The learner will:

I. Relate the Christian value DIGNITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL to reading selections

   A. Relate instances where respect for individuals is stated or implied in reading selections
   B. Explain why one should respect and accept every individual regardless of race, color, ethnicity, religion, sex, work, intellectual ability, or physical appearance
   C. Demonstrate respect for, acceptance of and courtesy toward everyone in speech and action
   D. Recognize stereotypes of gender bias in reading selection

II. Relate the Christian value RIGHT TO LIFE to reading selections

A. Recognize instances where the individual's Right to Life is directly stated or implied in a reading selection
B. Explain why every person has a right to life
C. Commit oneself through word and action to this belief and to the protection of human life

III. Relate the Christian value SACREDNESS OF THE FAMILY to reading selections

A. Recognize instances which illustrate the sacredness of the family and its importance to society
Identify causes of good family relationships

IV. Relate the Christian value NEED FOR LAWS AND REGULATIONS to reading selections

A. Recognize instances that illustrate the purposes and need for laws and regulations
B. Respect and observe the laws and regulations of the school, city, state and country

V. Relate the Christian value JUSTICE AND PEACE to reading selections

A. Demonstrate understanding of the Catholic interpretation of "peace," "justice," "injustice"
B. Recognize in reading selections causes of lack of peace and justice
C. Recognize in reading selections those promoting peace and justice

D. Translate into personal action the example of the peacemakers and those working for justice
E. Relate environmental problems to the value of peace and justice

VI. Relate the Christian value RESPECT FOR AMERICAN HERITAGE to reading selections

A. Appreciate persons contributing to our American heritage
B. Recognize instances in reading selections that illustrate the components of the American heritage: justice, equality, responsibility, diversity, privacy, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, right to vote
C. Demonstrate appreciation of one's American heritage by fulfilling one's responsibilities as an American

VII. Relate the Christian value RESPECT FOR PEOPLE OF DIFFERENT CULTURES to reading selections

A. Appreciate the cultures and traditions of different peoples as they are illustrated in stories, poems, drama
B. Demonstrate acceptance of and respect for the cultures, traditions and customs of all peoples

VIII. Relate the Christian value of INTERDEPENDENCE OF ALL HUMAN BEINGS to reading selections

A. Recognize the natural and spiritual interdependence of all human beings
B. Appreciate all that others add to life and living
C. Suggest ways in which individuals can interact harmoniously

IX. Relate the Christian value of GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE to reading selections
   A. Recognize instances in reading selections that indicate global interdependence
   B. Apply the value of global interdependence to reading and discussion on space science, technology, conversation, business

X. Develop a responsible INQUIRING MIND TO SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC ISSUES related to Christian values
   A. Be aware of the impact on human society of world events recounted in reading and the media
   B. Recognize in reading instances of injustice, oppression, and indifference to human suffering
   C. Recognize cultural bias and prejudice

XI. Relate the Christian value DIGNITY OF WORK to reading selections
   A. Perceive the dignity of different types of work and occupations as these are illustrated in reading selections
   B. Recognize the rights and obligations of both employer and employee
   C. Demonstrate in practice ways the conviction that work is dignified

XII. Relate the Christian value CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES to reading selections
   A. Explain why individuals and nations have an obligation to use natural resources wisely
   B. Suggest ways individuals, communities and nations can conserve and share natural resources

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction
- Introduction to Graded Course of Study i
- Table of Contents ii
- Philosophy of Catholic Education iii
- Goals for Catholic Schools in the Diocese of Cleveland iv

Preface to Each Grade Level
- Development and Application of Christian Values ... P-1
- Philosophy and Goals of the Curriculum P-3
- Format of Graded Course of Study P-5
- Development Continuum P-7
- Curriculum Matrix P-8
- Scope and Sequence in Phonics P-10
- Scope and Sequence in Grammar and Mechanics ... P-11
- Evaluation Policy and Procedures P-15

Performance Objectives
- Kindergarten K-1
- Grade One 1-1
- Grade Two 2-1
- Grade Three 3-1
- Grade Four 4-1
- Grade Five 5-1
- Grade Six 6-1
- Grade Seven 7-1
- Grade Eight 8-1

Appendix to Each Grade Level

Intervention Services Model.....A-1
Intervention in Reading A-3
Intervention in Writing A-5
Procedures in the Development of the
Elements of Manuscript Handwriting.....A-7 in K,1,2
Procedures in the Development of the
Process of Cursive Handwriting ..... A-7 in 2,3,4,5,6
Portfolio Assessment in Language Arts A-9
Glossary A-11

DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND

PHILOSOPHY OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Sources

WE BELIEVE that a philosophy of Catholic education begins with faith that God, in creating, gifted us with life, became one of us in His Son Jesus, and in the Person of His Spirit awaits our response to His unconditional overture of love. Jesus remains with the community He formed, witnessing and sharing the Good News in every age and with all people, ever yearning for a return of love either by a sincere response to conscience or by membership in His Church. It is from this perspective the educational ministry of the Catholic community flows.

Catholic Education

WE BELIEVE that education which is Catholic begins, with life, in the heart of the family. Parents, the primary educators, seed and nourish values deeply human, deeply spiritual. Affirmed, treasured, and supported by the loving witness of Christian faith communities, the child continues a lifelong response to God's love by growing and excelling through responsible involvement in the academic, cultural, and civic concerns of daily life.

Catholic Schools

WE BELIEVE that Catholic school is sensitive to the mandate of Jesus: "Love one another as I have loved you" as the goal toward which all Catholic education tends. The school community, in sharing this vision within an atmosphere designed to celebrate and practice

love of God and neighbor, is the most effective means available to the Church for the education of youth. This vision motivates students to grow academically, culturally, and socially. Among the values prized in the Catholic school are self-worth, self-discipline in the search for a moral way of life, and appreciation of our American heritage. With deep concern for their brothers and sisters, young people in the Catholic day schools and the parish school of religion form their personal response to truth, justice and love to God their Maker.

GOALS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

IN THE DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND

1. To communicate the gospel message of Jesus.

2. To provide opportunities to build and experience a faith community.

3. To orient students to the responsibility and experience of service because of their membership in the Christian community.

4. To provide students with the opportunity for growth in prayer.

5. To provide instruction in religious truths and values in such a way that they become an integrated part of the school program.

6. To develop a faculty and staff who by their presence and teaching express an integrated approach to learning and living in their lives.

7. To provide an academic program and environment conducive to the optimal development of each student.

****

To successfully implement this Graded Course of Study in Language Arts, the principal and faculty should examine the philosophy as well as the goals and objectives in order to accept them as they are or to adapt them to meet the specific needs of their students. A similar study should be made of the subject objectives in order to ensure a proper sequence of objectives from grade to grade.

When this is completed, and if some adaptation is thought to be necessary, an Introduction to the school's version of the Diocesan Graded Course of Study in Language Arts should be formulated, stating the purpose of the graded course of study and how it is to be used by the teachers and principal.

PHILOSOPHY
of the
GRADED COURSE OF STUDY IN LANGUAGE ARTS

The communication of the Gospel message by word and witness is central in Catholic education. A Graded Course of Study in Language Arts makes a unique and important contribution to the attaining of these goals in Catholic education. This philosophy envisions our schools motivating students to grow academically, culturally and socially in an

atmosphere "designed to celebrate and practice love of God and neighbor."

Developing skills in language and communication is basic to this vision as our schools prepare literate students for life in a changing society. The Catholic school focuses, therefore, on imparting to the student a general knowledge of English language and literature as well as fluency in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking.

Special emphasis is given to the development of comprehension and critical thinking skills because we believe that our students are to be prepared to make sound judgments based on Christian values.

Recognizing that a growing number of students in our Diocesan elementary schools are non-English speaking, bilingual or speak a non-standard English dialect, we are committed to develop within ourselves and in our classrooms an understanding and appreciation of the culture and language our students bring with them. While accepting the cultural pluralism in our society, we help our students move sequentially from competency in reading, in basic oral and written communication to the acquisition of standard English syntax and pronunciation.

Flowing from the PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION for the elementary and high schools of the diocese of Cleveland, the goals and objectives incorporate an instructional approach that is built on student experience, developed within the context of the language used by the students, in a logical sequence of teaching objectives related to the ability of the growing young person so that students will demonstrate growth in various aspects of oral and written language at each grade level.

GOALS
of the
GRADED COURSE OF STUDY IN LANGUAGE ARTS

THE GRADED COURSE OF STUDY IN LANGUAGE ARTS endeavors to attain the goals of Catholic education by forming Christians who:

--work cooperatively in a spirit of mutual service
--cultivate their intellectual growth and determine their aesthetic standards
--appreciate and enjoy a constantly widening scope of literature and the language in which it is communicated
--become aware of important historical and literary elements of our cultural heritage
--relate the ideas, feeling and experiences derived from literature and communicate them effectively to others
--use knowledge gained from reading to make sound judgments based on Christian principles
--realize that the effective and responsible use of the English language is crucial to becoming a Catholic influence in contemporary social justice and moral issues
--are encouraged to broaden their reading interests
--make choices in leisure reading and viewing activities grounded in literary discretion and moral judgments
--possess the tools of language necessary for critical evaluation of media, propaganda, news and advertisements
--integrate and apply language arts activities to all aspects of the curriculum

FORMAT OF GRADED COURSE OF STUDY IN LANGUAGE ARTS

The 1993 model English Language Arts Graded Course of Study follows a matrix consisting of four language processes along one axis and four dimensions of language along the other. Together this format constitutes the strands upon which the model is structured. Program objectives as well as subject objectives are included for all grade levels from kindergarten through grade eight. The instructional activities implemented by teachers will provide any developmentally appropriate differentiation.

The matrix consists of *four Language Process components* along one axis. These are:

Structure
Meaning Construction
Application
Multidisciplinary

The *four Dimensions of Language* to accompany each language process consist of the following components:

Reading
Writing
Listening/Visual Literacy
Oral Communication

The components of the Language Process and Dimensions of Language are highlighted as they appear in the instrument.

A listing of Performance Objectives precedes each grade level. Performance Objectives are highlighted in bold print as they appear within the grade level area.

The curriculum strands are grouped into grade clusters: kindergarten-two, three-five, and six-eight. Literacy development within, as well as between these clusters, is reflected by increases in the sophistication and complexity of student performance.

Each grade level segment contains:

Development and Application of Christian Values
Philosophy and Goals of the Curriculum
Format of Graded Course of Studies
Curriculum Matrix
Developmental Continuum
Development of Skills in Decoding
and Word Recognition
Evaluation Policy and Procedures

The Committee has deemed it important to define the cueing systems in determining word meanings. To aid the teacher in this respect, the Diocesan Scope and Sequence in the Development of Skills in Decoding and Word Recognition precedes each grade level in the instrument.

At every grade level in the elementary school the teacher will plan for a systematic teaching of grammar and mechanics of the English language to achieve:

1) a student awareness of correctness in listening, speaking and writing.
2) application in student writing.